

the passage of House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2038. Also, petition of the chairman, sponsoring committee, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., urging Congress to pass a resolution declaring its readiness to support all necessary measures for the defeat of Hitlerism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2039. Also, petition of the mayor and commissioners of the city of Houston, Tex., relative to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2040. Also, petition of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, Inc., San Angelo, Tex., pertaining to labor strikes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2041. Also, petition of the Commissioners' Court of Harris County, Tex., taking official cognizance of the fact that Congress has under consideration a proposed plan for the improvement of the Trinity River, Tex., for flood-control and allied purposes and for navigation, for inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. William Nesbit Vincent, pastor of Eastern Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, our Father, as Thou hast crowned this day with the light of the sun dispelling all the shadows of night, so we pray that Thou wilt crown our Nation with the Light of Him who is the Light of the world, dispelling all shadows of fear and of doubt. May that light bring guidance to this body, and the cause for which it stands. May the same light guide the Speaker and this House over which he presides. May that light guide us into the knowledge of the place we have in the family of nations. Especially we ask that Thou would send Thy light to the President of our Republic, giving him unerring counsel in his decisions, binding us together in that great family of States, that family named after Thee in whom we have our trust. May that light endow each elected leader of our Nation during these dark days with clarity of vision and unity of purpose. We ask it through Jesus Christ our Lord and for His sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 10, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of Lena B. Crouch;

H. R. 413. An act for the relief of Arma Lee Hogan;

H. R. 586. An act to authorize maintenance and use of a banking house upon the United States military reservation at Hickam Field, Oahu, Hawaii;

H. R. 588. An act to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at Honolulu, T. H.;

H. R. 666. An act for the relief of Frank Kassner;

H. R. 733. An act for the relief of Ryoichi Sumida;

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Kula Sanatorium;

H. R. 1106. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right-of-way to Grand Trunk Western Railroad Co. across the Kalamazoo National Guard Target Range, Mich.;

H. R. 1542. An act for the relief of Adolf Leon and his wife Felicia;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Anna and Fred Aebi;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Walter M. Ziegler;

H. R. 2208. An act for the relief of Lloyd Bryant;

H. R. 2378. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Moyer;

H. R. 2379. An act for the relief of Mary, Ethel, and Richard Farrell;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of Arnold H. Sommer;

H. R. 2462. An act for the relief of William Schoeb;

H. R. 2463. An act for the relief of the heirs of Donald Crump and Mrs. John N. Crump and for the relief of Emma Jane Crump and Mildred Lounedah Crump;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of the estate of Max Adams Shepard;

H. R. 2596. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge for the district of Massachusetts;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Peschke;

H. R. 2781. An act for the relief of Gdynia America Line, Inc., of New York City, N. Y.;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of John C. Martin;

H. R. 3003. An act for the relief of Lueberta Wilson;

H. R. 3086. An act for the relief of Harold E. Marquis;

H. R. 3174. An act for the relief of H. L. Reppart and others;

H. R. 3182. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of Augusta Brassil;

H. R. 3315. An act for the relief of Tibor Hoffmann and Magda Hoffmann;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of Frank E. Day;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of J. R. Giles;

H. R. 3643. An act for the relief of Kehl Markley, Jr.;

H. R. 3731. An act for the relief of Raymond J. McMahon;

H. R. 3872. An act for the relief of Towne school district No. 6, fractional Monroe Township, Newaygo County, Mich.;

H. R. 4061. An act for the relief of Louise L. Kapfer;

H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Alta Ledgerwood;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of James A. Sweeney;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of W. L. B. Van Dyke;

H. R. 4226. An act to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter designed for ice-breaking and assistance work on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of the Lawson Coffee Co., Inc.;

H. R. 4246. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ayers;

H. R. 4381. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of bridges across a portion of the Minnesota River in the State of Minnesota," approved March 15, 1904;

H. R. 4415. An act for the relief of the Macon County Oil Co.;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of Albert DeMatteis;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Hattie Dillon;

H. R. 4561. An act for the relief of Mrs. Della Thompson;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Regis Moxley and Frances Moxley;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Ray C. McMillen;

H. R. 4777. An act for the relief of Alexander Kehaya;

H. R. 4778. An act for the relief of Delbert E. Libbey;

H. R. 4791. An act to reimburse the city of McMinnville, Oreg., for damages assessed to it by the United States for innocent trespass upon land belonging to the United States;

H. R. 4803. An act for the relief of certain personnel of the Army on account of loss of personal property as a result of a fire on April 11, 1940, at Fort Benning, Ga.;

H. R. 4879. An act for the relief of J. A. Sandell and Frances Sandell;

H. R. 4904. An act to authorize transportation of employees of the United States on vessels of the Army transport service;

H. R. 4912. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 4961. An act to amend section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935;

H. R. 4964. An act for the relief of Elsie Hugaboom;

H. R. 4994. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at Bridge Street in Plymouth Borough, between Plymouth and Hanover Townships, in the county of Luzerne, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5021. An act for the relief of Capt. Alex Papanas;

H. R. 5076. An act to empower the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Kauai to issue improvement bonds;

H. R. 5077. An act to approve Act No. 112 of the Session Laws of 1941 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to amend Act 101 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, so as to extend the franchise to the districts of Kau and South Kohala, in said county, and extend the term thereof as to the town of Hilo";

H. R. 5079. An act to authorize the Treasurer of the United States to make settlements with payees of lost or stolen checks, which have been paid on forged endorsements, in advance of reclamation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5120. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of the remaining portion of the Grosse Point Light-house Reservation by deed to the city of Evanston, Ill.;

H. R. 5128. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction by Alabama Bridge Commission, an agency of the State of Alabama, of a toll bridge and causeway between Dauphin Island and the mainland at or near Cedar Point, within the State of Alabama;

H. R. 5203. An act to extend the provisions of the act of February 24, 1933, and of the act of June 29, 1940, to proceedings to punish for criminal contempt of court;

H. R. 5356. An act to constitute an Army Chaplains' Corps with a brigadier general as chief;

H. R. 5374. An act to authorize the transportation of employees of the Alaska Road Commission, and to validate payments made for that and other purposes;

H. R. 5498. An act for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli;

H. R. 5556. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota and the city of Minneapolis to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 5557. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.;

H. R. 5594. An act for the relief of the Kulp Lumber Co.;

H. R. 5600. An act to provide for payments in advance to enlisted men of monetary allowance in lieu of quarters and subsistence under certain conditions;

H. R. 5653. An act to extend, under certain conditions, the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the Army after the date of actual receipt by bureaus and offices of the War Department, and before transmitting the same to the General Accounting Office;

H. R. 5708. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act;

H. R. 5750. An act authorizing the procurement and issue of an Army of Occupation of Germany Medal for each person who served in Germany or Austria-Hungary during the period of occupation; and

H. R. 5783. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of certain naval local defense vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 268. An act for the relief of James Wood;

H. R. 466. An act for the relief of J. T. Colter;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Anthony O'Hara and Stephen F. Maroney;

H. R. 2963. An act for the relief of the estate of James C. Harris;

H. R. 3141. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of John K. Blackstone;

H. R. 4250. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Roland Boucher in recognition of his bravery and heroism in rescuing five children from drowning in Lake Champlain;

H. R. 4622. An act for the relief of Catharine Schultze;

H. R. 4795. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, by amending sections 203 (4), 208 (3), 209, 213, 215, 220, and 222 thereof and by adding thereto a new section to be numbered section 225, all relating to the powers, duties, and functions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida;

H. R. 5464. An act to authorize transfer of enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps;

H. R. 5553. An act providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce; and

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 272. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

S. 273. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.;

S. 274. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.;

S. 381. An act for the relief of Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith;

S. 806. An act for the relief of Carmella Ridgewell;

S. 1127. An act for the relief of Harriett Hawkins;

S. 1177. An act granting an annuity to William F. Pack;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 1372. An act to amend article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940;

S. 1523. An act for the relief of the Portland Sportswear Manufacturing Co.;

S. 1562. An act for the relief of William D. Warren;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Pauline Caton Robertson;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation;

S. 1762. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to release the claim of the United States to certain land within Cocino County, Ariz.;

S. 1771. An act for the relief of R. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership;

S. 1777. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Phillips and for the six minor children of Robert Lee Phillips and the late Estelle Phillips, namely, Robert Lee Phillips, Jr., James Rudolph Phillips, Katherine Phillips, Richard Eugene Phillips, Charles Ray Phillips, and David Delano Phillips;

S. 1778. An act for the relief of Leslie Truax;

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes;

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray;

S. 1906. An act for the relief of the estate of O. K. Himley;

S. 1958. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy;

S. 1973. An act to provide for the pay and costs of transportation of civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, and in Alaska;

S. 2024. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to undertake certain public works and for such purpose to issue bonds in a sum not exceeding \$250,000;

S. 2035. An act to amend sections 345 and 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-marketing quotas; and

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks by the insertion of a speech he delivered November 5, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PEACE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

STRIKES ON DEFENSE PROJECTS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by the insertion of a newspaper article and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two short poems which were written by a young woman from the home town of our reading clerk, Mr. Chaffee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the headlines in this morning's newspaper tell us that "Murray and Kennedy quit United States Labor Mediation Board over captive-mines decisions." Mr. Speaker, with the C. I. O. it is rule or ruin. They have proven that that is their attitude ever since you passed the Wagner Act and established the N. L. R. B., and the things that have happened since that time are very distasteful—in fact, disgraceful—to the American way of life, for free labor to work without being molested or driven into unions they did not want to join. We have before the Congress the Vinson bill, on which a rule has been granted, but the leaders and President refused to let it come on the floor of the House. It is up to the Congress to act, or you are liable to see trouble, and in order to avert trouble let us do our duty as good, sound, sensible American citizens elected by the people to keep this country free from coercion, because if we do not it may be too late. America will be wrecked from internal dissension by radical labor leaders, by Communists, and by those who put their own desires above that which is best for the welfare of the American form of government and the American people.

Mr. President, you have encouraged the radical element in this country; now you

must act. You must stop fooling; you must enforce the laws or America will be overthrown by internal dissension. Communism and radicalism are a greater danger to our way of life than any issue of this day. It is time to work and let work for the glory of all Americans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars and to include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the magazine Time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE C. I. O.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, there is no quorum present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Anderson, Calif.	Hendricks	Osmers
Andrews	Hinshaw	Plumley
Blackney	Hoffman	Rabaut
Boggs	Holmes	Ramspeck
Buckler, Minn.	Imhoff	Rockefeller
Byron	Jacobsen	Sacks
Chapman	Jenkins, Ohio	Satterfield
Clark	Jennings	Scanlon
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Schaefer, Ill.
Coolley	Kerr	Schuetz
Costello	Kleberg	Scrugham
Dies	Kunkel	Secrest
Dirksen	McArdle	Sheridan
Ditter	Maas	Smith, Pa.
Drewry	Magnuson	Smith, Wash.
Duncan	May	Snyder
Faddis	Mills, La.	Taber
Flannery	Mitchell	Tenerowicz
Fulmer	Monroney	Terry
Halleck	Mott	Vinson, Ga.
Harness	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Harrington	Nichols	Wheat
Harris, Va.	Norrell	Whelchel
Harter	O'Connor	White
Hartley	O'Day	
Healey	O'Leary	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO, by unanimous consent, was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDING THE NEUTRALITY ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 334, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider the Senate amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes; that the motion to concur in the said Senate amendments shall be considered as pending and that debate on said motion shall be limited to not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that at the conclusion of such debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to concur.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as usual.

This resolution, I am pleased to state, has been reported out of the committee by unanimous vote. I hope the rule will also be adopted by unanimous vote.

As you have heard from the reading of the resolution, 8 hours is allowed for general debate. The committee felt that this would give ample time for full discussion of the matter or the floor.

It is not necessary that I take up any of the time of the House at this time, and I therefore reserve the balance of my time. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is no opposition to this rule. Therefore the time under the rule will be used to discuss the bill. This issue is one of war or peace and therefore transcends all party lines. It must be debated on a high level, as it affects the security and destiny of America.

At the outset let us strip the issue of hypocrisy, deceit, and misrepresentation and consider it solely on its merits or demerits as it affects our national interest and the welfare of 130,000,000 Americans.

In the past those advocating the various measures affecting our foreign policy have always urged their adoption in the name of peace and keeping us out of war. This is an out-and-out war proposal. No amount of oratory or fiction can alter the facts. If our Government-owned ships, carrying Government-owned war supplies, go into British war zones and ports they will be attacked, and the inevitable result will be that the United States will be dragged into a total war.

There will be no such thing as a limited war after scores of American ships have

been sunk and thousands of American sailors drowned.

This is the last and ultimate step in the pattern to war. Those Members of the House who honestly believe it is to our best interest to enter the war should vote for this bill, and those who want to keep us out of the eternal wars of the Old World have an opportunity to register their decision against our being involved by indirection and subterfuge in these foreign wars.

I do not challenge the motives or patriotism of any Member of the House; each one must make this fateful decision for himself and for his constituents based on one yardstick—what is best for America, and not what is best for the British Empire, the Chinese, or the Communists.

The neutrality bill was misnamed. It never was conceived to be anything other than a peace measure to keep us out of war, and it has been successful in doing so for the past 2 years. It is enough to make the angels weep to try to depict the sending of our ships into the war zones as a peace measure.

Some Members of the House may attempt to torture the doctrine of the freedom of the seas into sanctioning the convoying of Government-owned ships filled with munitions of war into belligerent harbors. Such an argument would be too fantastic to be seriously advanced. It would be refuted by its own intellectual dishonesty.

No valid reasons have been presented to the Congress or to the American people explaining the need and urgency for sending our merchant ships into the war zones. Prime Minister Churchill within the month has stated that the battle of the Atlantic had been won and that there were two-thirds less sinkings during the last 3 months than the previous quarter. Our lend-lease supplies are being delivered with less than 4-percent loss.

Why, therefore, the need of haste to change the neutrality provisions in regard to the war zones, at a time when England's position in the Atlantic is most favorable? Why then jeopardize the lives of our sailors and the peace of America?

Is it simply and solely to cause the loss of American ships and lives in sufficient numbers to inflame the passions and arouse a spirit of vengeance among the American people who are overwhelmingly opposed to our entrance into the war?

I am informed that the British Government has 25,000,000 tons of shipping, or more than she had when the war started. We have only 7,000,000 tons and need our ships to obtain rubber, tin, manganese, and other essential war supplies, and desperately require additional ships to carry goods to South America for the purpose of fortifying our good-neighbor policy and the concept of hemispheric defense.

However, if we have any merchant vessels to spare now or in the future, why not turn them over to the British and let them sail under the British flag?

If the war-zone amendments in this bill are defeated, I will introduce or support a proposal to turn any available American merchant ships over to the

British to be operated by its Government.

This proposal before the House is a war measure. Let us here and now stop, by our votes, this march to war and further American expeditionary forces. It is not too late. We can still save America from all-out foreign wars. We have no right to wash our hands, like Pontius Pilate, and betray the American people to be crucified on the cross of Europe's eternal wars.

The decision on this war-provoking measure may be determined by one or two votes. The proposal, if adopted, becomes virtually a declaration for a Presidential war. It may be the most important vote to be cast since the formation of our Republic.

It will decide whether our destiny is to be on the war-torn battlefields of the Old World or whether our God-given destiny shall be fulfilled on the American Continent and in the Western Hemisphere.

I do not propose to gamble with the destiny of my country, or the lives of the American people, to carry the four freedoms to Soviet Russia, India, Asia, or Africa, where they are unknown and unsought.

I am convinced that America is making herself invincible on land, sea, and air, and, therefore, has nothing to fear from foreign dictators now or in the future. We are strong enough to keep out of war and to defend ourselves.

This is a great American issue. It must not be decided on the basis of what is best for the Communists and the British but rather on what is best for all the American people.

Must we commit national suicide by entering the shambles of Europe? Must we bankrupt and impoverish America for generations to come in foreign wars? Nothing but death, desolation, and disaster can follow. Even if we win by gigantic expenditures of blood and treasure we will only make all of Europe safe for communism. Is this America's service to humanity?

How much better to concentrate our military strength and productive force in the Western Hemisphere, to provide a devastated world with the necessary material and moral rehabilitation when peace once again comes to the exhausted warring nations.

Your decision is a momentous one. It will determine the fate of America and of unborn generations. By your vote you can save both our democratic institutions and America itself.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to have seen the House accept this rule without any controversy in order that it might have proceeded with debate on the resolution. I find this morning that the impression has been created that I have changed my position as regards the foreign policy of the administration. This is a mistake. The idea probably grew out of a statement I made in the Rules Committee when application for this rule was pending, which was to the effect that this afforded a very good opportunity for the House to test out the

good faith of the administration as regards the racketeers in labor. I intended, however, to express the view that I favored the bill. On the question that was disturbing me most I got my answer 2 days ago. I am very happy over the defeat with which Mr. Lewis met. The President now has Mr. Lewis under the hammer, and if he does not crack him wide open, he will miss an opportunity to render a wonderful service to this country and to the world.

With regard to the resolution which this rule will make in order, it is impossible for me to understand the logic of the position of those now opposing the resolution who have heretofore approved all that has been done on the part of the administration and the Congress with regard to our interest in the wars in Asia and in Europe. We are undertaking here to remove self-imposed limitations which we now find embarrassing in the free exercise of the national will. The Neutrality Act was one adjusted to times of peace, that is, as applied to this country as a neutral. Since the adoption of that measure conditions have changed. Events have moved us far down the road that leads to war. As a matter of fact, I have taken the position all the while that with the destroyer transaction and the adoption of the lend-lease bill we entered into the war. Many, however, have clung to the idea that that was not such an unneutral act as could be claimed to be a participation in the conflict. But you gentlemen who supported the lend-lease bill know that it was not a neutral act; that it was an expression of interest in belligerents in the wars that are now pending. Advancements to China are not neutral acts; as a matter of fact, they are acts of war, and every Member of this House knows it. The furnishing of materials to England is not a neutral act, it is an act of war; and every Member of this House knows it. What Member of the House would approve of extending aid to Japan? What Member of this House would approve of extending aid to Germany? There is not a Member of this body who would dare stand on his feet and declare to the country that he was in favor of any such proposition. You must therefore confess that our situation has changed, has greatly changed, since we adopted the Neutrality Act, and that we are not neutral, but are involved in the conflict.

You have been insisting upon the removal of all obstructions to the building of our national defense. You have been insisting upon the removal of all obstruction to the strengthening of our armed forces, and yet here there are those of you who still hope that we may escape sending our Navy and our Army into open conflict. You are opposing the doing of that which is vital and necessary to make it possible that we should exercise free action in regard to these wars that are destroying the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defense measure and I hope those Members who still hope for peace may find it possible to reconcile their position on the Lend-Lease Act with this bill. Our weakness is disunity here at home. Congress should set the country an example and make known to

Hitler that we intend to fulfill all commitments that we have made to our allies, China on the one hand and England on the other, and that we intend to defend America at all costs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take 5 minutes. I do not believe there is any serious fight on this rule; but I am taking this time to answer a question or two that have been asked me concerning just how the rule operates, by reason of my membership on the Rules Committee.

When the previous question is ordered on the rule, we will vote on the rule. The rule will be adopted. After the rule is adopted the Speaker will have the Senate amendment to the House resolution read by the Clerk. Then there will be 8 hours' debate on whether or not the House shall agree to the Senate amendment. At the expiration of the 8 hours' debate, the House will vote "yes" or "no" on the Senate amendment.

There will be no debate under the 5-minute rule; and, of course, there will be no opportunity for the offering of amendments. If the resolution is not agreed to—in other words, if the rule should be voted down—then the House resolution with the Senate amendment will be in exactly the same position it was before we commenced consideration of this rule.

Now, let us get that clear. If this resolution is voted down at the end of the 8 hours' debate, the House resolution with the Senate amendment will be on the Speaker's desk. It may then be taken from the Speaker's desk by unanimous consent and sent to conference, or another rule may be granted dealing with the situation. I thought it would be well for everyone to understand just what the parliamentary situation is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the rule as presented, at the conclusion of the debate, a motion to concur will be considered as having been made; that is, the previous question will have been ordered. There will then be no opportunity to offer a preferential motion such as a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is quite right. As I interpret this rule, it makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 237 with the Senate amendment. The only question before the House will be the desirability of accepting or rejecting the Senate amendment. If the amendment is accepted, the resolution goes directly to the President and requires no further Senate action. If the amendment is rejected, that ends the vitality of this rule. Every rule or resolution of this nature changes to some extent the general rules of the House. A final vote is provided for on every bill or resolution made in order by a rule. When that vote has been had, the rule has no further force or effect and in no

way authorizes further action on the part of the House.

When House Joint Resolution 237, providing for the arming of our merchant ships, was before the House on October 17, 1941, I gave the reasons why I intended to vote against it. Among other things, at that time I said:

In my judgment, the President has no notion that this bill will come to the White House in its present form. It will pass the House because many Members feel it is innocuous under present circumstances. The President's message makes it clear that the elimination of section 6 is one of the minor changes which he demands. However, with the bill passed by the House, the Senate will be in a position to add such further amendments to the neutrality law as the President wants. If there are enough votes in the Senate to repeal the entire law, that will be done. If there are only enough votes to repeal the prohibition against sending our ships into belligerent waters, then that will be added. I think the House can look forward to the bill being returned materially changed. The final law will be written by the conference committee, and the House will have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on the conference report. There will be very little debate and no effective way to change what the conferees determine the law should be. This is too important a bill to start on its way in the hope that it will not be broadened. No one is justified in casting his vote today on any such theory.

In a general way, my prediction was correct. The resolution is before us today with the additional provision authorizing our merchant ships to go into belligerent waters. That is the potent part. This procedure eliminates the conference committee to which I referred on October 17. However, if this Senate amendment is voted down, then there is a possibility of a conference, but as a practical matter it is difficult to imagine the House conferees, headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] consenting to the elimination of the belligerent-waters clause repeal included in the Senate amendment.

There will be a great demand for time. The 8 hours provided for in this rule is already oversubscribed. My views are known to the House. I therefore do not want to take more time.

I shall vote against the Senate amendment to the House resolution, primarily because it is in effect equivalent to a declaration of war, although it has been heralded as something else. If this country is to go into this foreign war, it should enter through the front door and the people should be advised of the truth. I hope the Members will remain on the floor and listen to the debate. I hope the people will read the debate. If they do, they will know that the opposition to repeal of the neutrality law is not partisan and is not confined to the minority party. This is a patriotic issue and nothing else. There are differences of opinion as to the best course to pursue, but these differences are honest and inspired by the highest of motives. Every Member of the House appreciates his responsibility in this tragic hour. May sincerity, integrity, deliberation, and courage guide us.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have supported every foreign policy of this administration, without exception. I have voted for every appropriation for the defense program. I have supported all legislation proposed by the administration in furtherance of that effort, without exception.

On October 9 the President sent a message to Congress asking specifically for the repeal of that provision of the Neutrality Act which prohibited the arming of merchant vessels plying their lawful trade in neutral ports and on the high seas. I supported that measure. We were given to understand that that was what was needed and desired at this time. The bill comes back to us from the Senate in the form of what is, in effect, a declaration of war. It comes as a vastly different proposal and comes to us under the parliamentary situation that we are permitted no opportunity for amendment or for reservation. It authorizes not only the arming of our merchant vessels for their self-protection but authorizes their entrance into the belligerent ports of the world. If we send those merchant vessels into belligerent ports, the necessary implication follows that we will protect them in those ports with the American Navy.

And so we meet today the stark proposal to enter an undeclared naval warfare with the Axis Powers—a warfare for which we are ill-equipped, ill-trained, and ill-prepared.

I cannot find it within my conscience to take that step in our present state of domestic turmoil and uncertainty. For my part, I insist that we should first be prepared. The vital part of that preparation is that we shall learn to govern ourselves and the unruly elements within our midst before we undertake by physical combat to settle the complex affairs of a troubled world. I hope that the House will today vote down this rule that gives you no choice except to concur supinely in the Senate amendment. If the rule is voted down, the bill can go to a committee of conference between the Senate and House for further consideration. I, for one, am unwilling to vote to plunge this country into the horrors and uncertainties of war until we have first set our own house in order, and quelled the labor insurrection, with its violence and bloodshed, that is occurring daily in our midst, or until the President and his administration is ready to take a firm stand in behalf of the great masses of American people and recommend measures that will put a stop to the labor dictatorship that has been sabotaging our defense effort from the moment of its inception.

We have all watched—some with alarm, others with complacency—while our country has gradually drifted, step by step, into what is now a full-fledged labor government, controlled not by the masses of the workers of America, not by the Constitution and laws of the United States, not by the duly elected representatives of the people, but by a few

willful, power-drunken labor leaders, who seek first their own autocratic control over our destinies.

We have waited for more than a year to see if these leaders of organized labor could not be brought to a sense of their responsibilities through appeal to their supposed patriotism. It is obvious now that the situation cannot be controlled by high-sounding phrases or patriotic appeals, no matter how humble. What the American people are praying for today is a firm stand and stern action by the President of the United States. It is not enough to appeal to the patriotism of those who know not the meaning of the word. We must have a showdown. We must learn once and for all whether this Government is run by the duly elected representatives of the American people or by a few self-willed labor leaders.

The situation has gone from bad to worse, day by day, until now we look with resignation, if not complacency, upon audacities and outrages that a year ago would have stirred the American people to irresistible anger.

For more than a year, legislation has been pending before three committees of the House, any one of which could have acted and should have acted. Those bills have accumulated dust in the pigeonholes of committees while the situation has grown progressively worse until it has now become intolerable. And, yet, no word has come from the White House to Congress suggesting remedial measures.

Gradually, day by day, we have seen the inalienable and constitutional rights of American citizens to earn their livelihood unmolested, whittled away until today free-born American citizens, presumably living under the protection of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, are told that they cannot work on Government projects unless they pay tribute to the overlords of labor. In the recent Currier case, there was brought to light the confidential agreement entered into by the Office of Production Management and the American Federation of Labor, which, in effect, denied to American workers in the construction industry the right to work unless they paid tribute to a particular union, namely, the American Federation of Labor, a contract made in direct violation of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. And yet, to this moment there has come from this administration neither repudiation nor reproach for this monstrosity imposed upon the American people by Sidney Hillman, notwithstanding the fact that the refusal in the Currier case to award the contract to the low bidder meant a loss to the Treasury of the United States of between one-quarter and a half million dollars as a tribute to labor dictatorship.

When that incident was disclosed, I demanded on the floor of the House that those concerned in this fraud upon the American people be indicted for their conspiracy. I repeat that demand today, hoping now, as I hoped then, that it will not fall upon deaf ears.

But what was the alleged justification for that fraud upon the American tax-

payer and the American workingman? It was a clause in that confidential agreement by which the American Federation of Labor agreed that there should be no strikes in the construction industry "for any cause." And what do we see today? A strike on naval projects on the West Coast by the American Federation of Labor construction unions that has halted work on our vital naval program; a strike so unjustified, so violent, and so destructive of our preparedness effort that the United States Navy has been compelled to intervene through the armed forces of the United States. So outrageous has been the conduct in this instance, that on yesterday Admiral Blakely, in charge of the project, boldly and truthfully called it a revolt against the Government.

You may go back over the history of these strikes in defense industries for the past year and you will find two significant and ominous circumstances connected with them. First, they have struck at the very vitals of our defense program. They have struck at our shipbuilding, at our airplane factories, at our automobile industry, at our steel industry and our coal-mining industry. The American people had best face the facts. Should your labor dictators, at any moment, take the whimsical fancy to tie up simultaneously, as they can under present conditions, these five vital industries, the United States would be as helpless as the people of Poland, France, Holland, and Belgium when the Hitler war machine rolled over their defenseless countries.

Secondly, in almost every instance, the demand has been for a closed or union shop, which, in simple terms, destroys the constitutional right of the American workingman to work without paying tribute to a labor union. The National Labor Relations Act specifically prohibits the closed shop except where it is voluntarily agreed to. It is prohibited by law because we know that the right to work and earn a living is the most vital right of free-born American citizens. Without work, man cannot earn; without earning, he cannot buy food, and without food he cannot live. And so, this demand for the closed shop, in its ultimate analysis, destroys his very right of existence. No more absurd and outrageous proposal can be conceived of, and yet, we sit idly by, day by day, with our eyes open and see this yoke being forced upon the unwilling necks of the American workers.

We can no longer temporize with this situation. Patriotic appeals and humble petitions have been alike futile to halt the ravages of this Frankenstein which we have built through unjust and one-sided laws, patently and admittedly, designed to impose upon an unwilling public the labor dictatorship which now threatens to destroy us.

I have mentioned the grip now held upon the vital shipbuilding, automobile, aircraft, steel, and coal industries. I did not mention the oil industry.

Up to now, that has never been dominated and controlled by the barons of labor, but it is not to be overlooked in this hour of the Nation's peril. The saboteurs of the Nation's defense have not over-

looked this most vital of all our defense needs, and you have doubtless seen in recent issues in the press the announcement of the C. I. O. that it now proposes to take over the oil industry. It has set up a fund and an organization to bring this most vital of all our defense industries within its power and domination; and it has selected, as the dictator in this field, the disgruntled and discredited former member of the National Labor Relations Board, Edwin S. Smith, distinguished for his radical proclivities and his consistent record for persecution of American industry while a member of the Labor Board.

But are these labor dictators satisfied with their sabotaging of their defense effort at home? No. Recent dispatches show that they are preparing to launch into the international field to halt the production of implements in foreign countries, whose defense the President has proclaimed to be vital to the defense of the United States. I refer to the recent announcement of R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers of America, C. I. O., who blandly announces that he has authorized an embargo on automobile parts going from the Ford factory in Michigan to the Ford Co. of Canada. With the cunning inherent in his kind, he realizes that, if he can stop the shipment of the needed parts from the American to the Canadian factory, he can shut down the manufacture in Canada of this vital equipment.

We must no longer depend upon patriotic speeches and humble appeals to the overlords of labor. The time for a show-down is long overdue. Let us meet the issue before it is too late. Before we get into this war, let us know whether our country is being run under the Constitution or under the selfish dictatorship of the Lewises, the Hillmans, the Tobins, the Thomases, and the hordes of selfish labor barons exploiting the honest American workingman for their own aggrandizement.

I have reluctantly reached the parting of the ways. I can take no further steps to war. I can no further imperil the destinies of our drafted Army and our splendid Navy until the President is moved to assert and protect the right of American citizens to work under the Constitution instead of under the dictatorship of our labor lords.

I take this stand after long consideration, knowing full well its implications and possible consequences to me, but it is time for the representatives of the people to speak out and to refuse to undertake to settle the affairs of a troubled world while we are still unable to govern ourselves.

When we cannot protect the constitutional right of our citizens to work or protect them from violence, assault, and murder in their attempt to exercise that right, I am unwilling to further appease these lions of labor by continuing to throw to them the tattered remnants of the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights at the expense of the freedom and independence of our citizens.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, the House of Representatives amended section 6 of the Neutrality Act, to permit the arming of American vessels. On this change in the Neutrality Act I voted "no." On November 7, the Senate further amended the Neutrality Act by repealing section 2, to permit commerce with states engaged in armed conflict, and section 3 of such act, to allow our ships to enter combat areas.

In less than 100 words and 500 minutes we are asked to accept the Senate amendment and to scrap the Neutrality Act. Those of us who were in Congress in 1935 and who worked and voted for the original Neutrality Act, in the belief and on the assurance of the present administration that its enactment into law would keep our country out of foreign wars, are today heartbroken and disillusioned by the action of the Senate, in which they emasculated and literally destroyed the Neutrality Act.

We still have an opportunity to vote down the Senate amendment; and I, for one, intend to do everything in my power to defeat the Senate amendment to the Neutrality Act. I shall vote "no" on the pending resolution and I intend to vote "no" on any other attempt to repeal what is still left of the Neutrality Act.

The Members of the House have been urged by a previous speaker to be consistent by voting for this resolution. Having voted for other changes in the Neutrality Act, it was suggested that the membership is in duty bound to continue to vote affirmatively on all subsequent changes to the Neutrality Act. To so vote would neither be consistent nor logical. That reasoning is defective and leads to a false conclusion.

Time changes our point of view, and things we held dear yesterday are today rejected and spurned. Finland, the only European government to pay its debt to the United States Government, was extolled and praised by us, from the President down, but is now considered to be hostile to the plan of the United States. Recently the Secretary of State scolded and criticized little Finland because she was fighting against Russia. Consider the fact that Finland, with an area of 135,000 square miles and a population considerably less than 4,000,000 souls, is now being chided by the United States because it is opposing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which has an area of 8,000,000 square miles and a population of more than 166,000,000 people.

It is a sad state of affairs and represents a very low national viewpoint when, in response to the demands of the British Government, our State Department presumes to tell Finland what course to pursue in her fight against Russia.

The President of the United States announced a loan of \$1,000,000,000 to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics without interest, due and payable 5 years after the end of the war. In the meantime, the people of the United States will have to pay the interest on the Russian loan. I think, as far as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is concerned, that day, "5 years after the war," will never come; and, if experience

means anything, we may expect to have the whole debt repudiated.

Our Government may inject itself into the internal affairs of European governments to help them in case of famine, pestilence, or destruction from causes beyond their control, but there is no excuse for this Nation to persist in a course of action which invites trouble and may lead to war.

To permit our ships to enter combat areas may very well lead to war, and our time should be devoted to keeping us away from war and urging other nations to do likewise.

We are helping the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain, and China with brain-power, money, food, and implements of war. Because of the help that we are giving to these foreign governments, now engaged in a war of butchery and annihilation, to which there seems to be no end, we are placing upon the shoulders of the American taxpayers a national debt of deadly proportions and an income tax that, for years to come, will penalize every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Before it is too late and before we have dissipated the national wealth of this country and deprived our citizens of their savings and their homes, let us call a halt to this wide augury of spending, lending, and donating our precious resources to the warmongering countries beyond the Atlantic.

Let us defeat the pending resolution and serve notice upon the President and the State Department that we want them to work for peace, and peace alone. Let us make them understand, by our action here today, that we are voicing the sentiments of the mothers and fathers of this country against war and everything connected with war.

Rather than have one American boy lose his life in the bloody conflict for power and territory now raging in Europe, I would be willing that our Government lose the billions of dollars that have already been spent to assist these countries.

Life is precious, and to every mother in this country there is nothing as close and as dear as her boy. Before I cast my vote for legislation which may be the possible cause of war and the tearing from a mother's bosom the pride and joy of her life, I am going to resist with all my strength and influence legislation which leads away from peace and toward war.

I earnestly implore the entire membership to join me in my efforts to preserve our beloved country from war, and to obtain for her and all her sons and daughters the blessings of peace, by voting for the retention of the Neutrality Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in one respect at least I am in complete accord with the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He has stated upon the floor of this House innumerable times that in supporting these various resolutions and pieces of legislation he was acting under

no delusions that they were intended to provide peace for America. He has voted for them because he knew in his heart that they collectively meant nothing short of a declaration of war. He honestly and sincerely believes that we should go to war. I, as one Member of this body, have voted against every one of these pieces of legislation because I knew that they would inevitably lead us to the point where there was no alternative or escape except active participation in this war with all of its dreadful consequences.

In one respect, however, I am unable to understand the logic of the gentleman from Georgia, who is a distinguished lawyer. He stated in the speech he just made that the neutrality bill was adjusted to times of peace and that conditions have now changed. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, which he well knows, that the neutrality legislation could not become effective and vital except in time of war. It could not become vitalized until war broke out on another continent; then and only then was the neutrality law to come into force by Executive proclamation. It was designed to fit a situation in time of war, not in time of peace.

Now you propose to destroy it. In order to preserve peace? No. In order that you may send ships into the war zones and belligerent ports, which the gentleman from Georgia correctly states is an act of war and means nothing else but war. The gentleman from Georgia knows in his heart that if we send these ships with war supplies into the Persian Gulf or up into the Red Sea at Suez or to any ports in Africa, that the secret plan is not only to send the ships but to arrange for troops there, troops to man those bases that are necessary in order to land the supplies. He knows that the cry will shortly go up for the Regular Army and the Marines to be sent over to those places to see to it that the tanks and the war material get through to Persia, Iran, Irak, and Russia, the projected scene of a new battle front.

Those troops will be sent there and, then the call will come, "We must protect our troops, we must see that those small numbers of men are protected." Then the demand will be made for the conscript army, and we will be in this war full blast with millions of our men again compelled to form another A. E. F.

I doubt if any Member of this body can save his or her conscience with the thought that a vote for this resolution is a vote for peace. You and each of you know down in your heart you are taking the last step toward war, and are taking it in defiance of the overwhelming majority of the people of America. Take that chance if you dare. I, as one Member, refuse to take that chance. I will vote "no."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a few years ago there was a very popular motion picture by the name of Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. The theme song of

that picture was Heigh-Ho, to Work We Go. May I respectfully suggest that an appropriate theme song for the Roosevelt war administration would be Heigh-Ho, to War We Go—not bravely and forthrightly in accordance with the best American traditions, but deviously, inch by inch, and by indirection.

Prior to the 1940 Presidential election we unanimously refused to accept even a qualifying share in this war. But gradually, along about the lease-lend period, we became a minority stockholder. Now it appears that the administration wants to put us in the position of a majority stockholder, in violation of the strongest and most unequivocal pledges ever made by any administration to the American people and in contravention of the will of the majority of our people.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker. I am still standing foursquare on the declaration I made on the floor of the House last February that I shall support every measure to carry out the avowed policy of this country to give maximum material aid to embattled England in the courageous fight she is waging against the brute force and despicable ideologies of the Axis Powers, which are a stench in the nostrils of every decent man and woman on the face of the globe. The RECORD shows that I have voted for every appropriation bill dealing with national defense and to implement the lease-lend program. When this resolution was first before the House last month in its original form, merely repealing section 6 of the Neutrality Act, I supported it and voted for it on the premise—and the right premise—that it is only fair and just that the American boys who man our merchant vessels plying the commercial trade routes should be given the means of protecting their lives in the event their ships are subjected to wanton and illegal attack. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support the measure in the form in which it has come back from the Senate because, by striking out sections 2 and 3 of the act, it emasculates entirely our neutrality status.

The argument that permitting our merchant ships, flying the American flag, laden with war materials for England and Russia, convoyed by American warships, to sail into the ports of England and Russia will not involve us in total war is so tenuous as to be almost absurd. It would not be given credence by a boy in the kindergarten of a school for the feeble-minded.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, we are not sending our ships by this resolution merely into the comparatively protected ports of the English Channel. They are to be sent into all the war zones—into the Gulf of Persia, into the port of Murmansk, into the Red Sea, and perhaps into the Black Sea, and through the Suez Canal—subject to all the perils of dive bombing, torpedoing, fire from shore batteries, and all the other inferno of modern warfare. That will be engaging in stark, bitter, all-out war, just as sure as today is Wednesday. May I say unequivocally at this point that I am opposing this resolution primarily because it is not the will of the great majority of

the American people that we become further involved in this war; and, even if the reverse were true, we are not yet prepared to be a main participant in a war of this scale. Let us more amply gird our loins for battle before we rush into the fray.

From a practical standpoint, is it necessary for us to permit American ships sailing under the American flag to sail into belligerent ports in order to fully effectuate the lease-lend program? According to the latest figures available, the British shipping strength as of last September was approximately 7,000,000 tons more than it was at the beginning of the war. Just last Friday Mr. Churchill, in a speech to industrial workers at Newcastle, England, said: "We have passed through the darkest and most perilous side of this struggle and are once more masters of our destiny." Giving full faith and credit to the Prime Minister's words, it is gratifying to realize that the pressure on the English is relaxing—that they are "over the hump."

Yesterday a significant news article appeared to the effect that "the Institute of London Underwriters today announced a 25-percent reduction in the war risk marine insurance rates between British ports not east of Southampton and the Americas."

Is it not reasonable to assume, in the absence of authentic data on ship losses, that if the submarine menace were as great as it was last winter the English underwriters would not be cutting the marine insurance rate by one-quarter?

It has been argued, and it will be argued during this debate, that the conditions have changed since the Neutrality Act was enacted, but let us be realistic. Has there been any change since the fall of 1940, not since August 1939, when this act was enacted, but since 1940, when all of us were saying in our campaign speeches and in our letters to our constituents, and our prospective constituents, that we would never, never vote for the involvement of our country in foreign wars again? At that time all the cards had been dealt. The chips were all down. At that time the Low Countries had fallen, France had cravenly surrendered, London was being ferociously bombed from the air almost every night, and what was proclaimed as only an economic pact between Russia and Germany seemed to be developing into actually a war pact. Yet at that time the clearest and most positive statements were made by the candidates for the Presidency of both major parties that our country would not become embroiled in the wars of Europe.

It seems rather trite and redundant to be repeating statements which were made during the campaign, because they have been cited and quoted here so often, but let me read just one especially significant statement made by Mr. Roosevelt—significant because of the fact that he makes specific reference to the Neutrality Act. This statement was made by Mr. Roosevelt during one of his closing campaign speeches in my home city of New York:

By the Neutrality Act and by other steps, in all these ways, we made it clear to every

American and every foreign nation that we would avoid becoming entangled in some episode beyond our borders. These were measures to keep us at peace, and through all the years of the war since 1935 there has been no entanglement, and there will be no entanglement.

Mr. Speaker, the President could not have made a clearer statement of national policy or a more positive promise to the American people. And, mind you, when these words were uttered, the war in Europe had reached its highest crescendo and the doom of England appeared to have been sealed.

On a more modest scale I made a somewhat similar pledge to the members of my constituency. During my campaign for Congress I sent out this circular to every boy in my district who was drafted. On the day that he left to be inducted he received a copy through the mail. This was not just a political maneuver on my part. Oh, no; it was, and is, a binding covenant. At the top of the page on the left are the words "Training—Yes," and on the right are the words "War—No." Then appears the following:

Your number has been drawn in the national conscription. I am not interested in your politics, but I am in your safety. As a veteran of World War No. 1, and now an Army Reserve officer, I do not want to see American boys mobilized to fight in foreign lands for somebody else's cause. If you elect me to Congress from your district, I pledge myself to fight for adequate defense training but no overseas war.

Mr. Speaker, that is just as solemn and binding a pledge as I ever made in my home, in my church, or in the courtroom. It is a pledge that I will faithfully perform until such time as our country, or its sovereignty, is imperiled. God grant that that time may never come. Let us employ reason and calm thinking in coping with these momentous problems. Let us not be swept off our feet by the depth of our emotions. Although we are sailing stormy seas now, we will surely come safely into port. It has been ever thus with the American people.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I think no one could discount the importance of the question with which we are dealing, and about which I wish to be neither oratorical nor demagogic. This House by substantial majorities has twice appropriated large sums of money to aid England and her allies, totaling, I believe, something like \$13,000,000,000. This had three distinct results. Thereby we led those whom we sought to aid to believe that we would do so. Thereby we laid upon the taxpayers of this country a tremendous burden. And the expenditure of this money, going as it naturally will into one particular channel of our national industry, will tend to unbalance it in ways we are already beginning to find out about.

It seems to me as a matter of common sense it is perfectly silly and unjustifiable to do this if it is to amount to nothing, or if the munitions to be manufactured with these appropriations are to waste away in our warehouses or at our

docks or go to the bottom of the sea. If this happens, then we have done worse than nothing by appropriating such a staggering sum of money for a purpose that will not be effectuated.

I think we are at the cross-roads. We have reached the point where we either have to make this effort effective or we should in frankness right about face and quit the entire lend-lease policy.

These materials of war can never do that for which we provided the money unless they reach their destination. Otherwise they are worse than useless, and I hope gentlemen who vote against this measure, should they be in the majority, will realize their responsibilities in annulling and making ineffective the lend-lease program upon which we have gone so far up to date. I sometimes am moved to wonder what would be the policy of the gentlemen who are so readily critical of the foreign policy of this administration. I have listened to their speeches in the debates. I have heard much criticism, but frankness compels me to say that I have not yet heard any constructive suggestions. What would they have us do? Are they willing for any man who sees fit to do so to mark off so much of the great oceans of the world as it suits his purpose to occupy and serve notice on us to keep out? Do the gentlemen who oppose the present policy feel that America should degenerate into a 3-mile-limit nation?

The passage of the pending resolution does not mean war. It does not necessarily mean that our ships would be sent to belligerent ports. It only restores our ancient right to send our ships wherever upon the high seas we determine it to be to America's best interest that they should go. We can afford to claim no lesser right. The world has become a ghost city. Doubt, uncertainty, fear, and chaos are abroad. Madmen are undertaking to stalk liberty and justice from the face of the earth. We know not what a day or a hour may bring forth. We are manning, training, and equipping a great army. Our air force is growing by leaps and bounds. We are doubling the size of our Navy. There should be no fetters on any of them. We should be free to employ any or all of them whenever and wherever the safety of our country dictates. Such, in my humble judgment, is the safest defense of the things we hold so dear, and therein lies the greatest measure of safety for the magnificent body of young men who have been called to the colors.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to two significant news items of yesterday bearing upon this fateful decision that we are to make. This bill is proposed, first, to carry out the lend-lease law; and, second, as some sort of indirect decision on a broad foreign policy.

The Washington Times-Herald of last night carried the following Associated Press dispatch from London, England:

The Institute of London Underwriters today announced a 25-percent reduction in the

war-risk marine insurance rate between British ports each of Southampton and the Americas.

That means that goods are being delivered successfully under existing law.

The second dispatch shows the broader meaning of this bill. It was an Associated Press item in this morning's Washington Post, and it also comes from London:

LONDON, November 11.—Gen. Charles De-Gaulle, Free French leader, declared in an Armistice Day broadcast tonight that France "sees America advancing step by step toward the battlefields," and said that his country was "tense with hope of victory and the oath of vengeance."

Step by step, Mr. Speaker, toward what? Victory and vengeance. Whose victory? A victory to be won by the United States. Whose vengeance? Vengeance to be inflicted by the French.

So there we have it from General De-Gaulle—step by step toward the battlefield, toward victory and vengeance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up all the remaining time, but there are a few comments I do want to make.

In particular I want to call your attention to the unprecedented flood of propaganda with which we are being deluged. Never have I seen its like. In the past few years there have been occasions, for instance, at the time of the so-called death penalty against holding companies, when we thought the peak had certainly been reached in systematized propaganda. But it could not compare with the wave of propaganda that now engulfs us. This Nazi and Fascist inspired propaganda has reached a point where something must be done, and before long I hope that we will have a complete exposé of the entire foreign network of propaganda, the identity of those associated with it, and the source of money supporting it.

Thousands of letters, telegrams, and post cards have come to my office in the past couple of days. Most of them bear German names. That may be a coincidence, but I am more inclined to believe that some citizens of foreign extraction have permitted themselves to be fooled by German agents, to put it bluntly.

Mr. Speaker, I have been the recipient of thousands of letters during the past few days, most of which carried practically the same, identical verbiage, which establishes beyond doubt the carefully laid out letter-propaganda campaign to sway or confuse the minds of the Members of this House. On the other hand, I have received hundreds of letters urging the repeal of the Neutrality Act, giving honest-to-God reasons that for the protection and future well-being of our Nation that repeal should be effected. One of these letters, from O. W. Wells, of New York City, has struck me with such force that I am constrained to insert extracts from it without unduly encumbering the RECORD in inserting the complete letter. The original letter was addressed to a Member of the House, and I shall refrain from mentioning

names. I quote some excerpts or paragraphs therefrom:

As a Republican I am sorry to see you and other responsible Republican leaders in the Republican Party opposing the administration in its efforts to repeal the present so-called Neutrality Act, foisted upon this country from behind the scenes by German propaganda, and the distortion of facts by that German sympathizer and apologist. * * *

I do not belong to any "pressure group." There are, in my opinion, too many of them today permitting others (notably those who purchase time on the radio) to do their thinking and tell them what to write to their Congressman. I am writing you as one who does his own thinking and who has believed from the outset that the present so-called Neutrality Act was conceived in Berlin and given birth in this country through the untiring efforts of * * *. How much the Germans have paid him and others for their work in Germany's behalf it is, of course, impossible, at this time, to say; but if no money has actually passed, then * * * and some others are at least deserving of the Iron Cross from a people whose chief aim for the past 40 years has been to dominate the world. And in the building up of any army and navy trying to accomplish it, they have during much of that time forced their neighbors to "arm to the teeth," to say nothing of their responsibility for the needless sacrifice of millions of lives.

Today we see the papers carrying on a campaign of abuse and distorting facts in an effort to save the present piece of German-inspired legislation.

If this act is not repealed and the Germans should win the war, it is my fervent hope that the sons or grandsons of every man who votes against its repeal will be forced into the Army should we be called upon to cross swords with Germany, a country which has never been a friend of the United States. She showed her hand at Manila Bay over 40 years ago. That is a matter of history. And she will more than show her hand to us again if the democracies should lose the present conflict.

I am as anxious as anyone possibly can be to see this country kept out of war, if for no other reason than that I have two sons of military age, one of whom has been a member of the New York National Guard for the past 6 years; but I don't believe the retention of this piece of German-inspired legislation is any guaranty that we will not become involved, or that its repeal is going to force us into war.

I have all the confidence in the world in the Members of this House. I know that each of us has a great love for this Nation, for its freedoms and its democracy. Therefore I do not want to be misunderstood as reflecting in any way upon any Member's sincerity or patriotism when I say that some Members, unfortunately, may permit themselves to be swayed by propaganda.

Let us by all means face the seriousness of world affairs today, and not be guided by politics or personal ambitions. You gentlemen all know that I have consistently been against war, but so long ago as March 18, 1938, in a speech on this floor, I outlined the course of conquest that Hitler has followed. I warned against the danger of his efforts toward world domination. Fourteen nations of Europe now suffer under his domination.

His own writings, in Mein Kampf, should convince anyone that he can never be satisfied short of world subjugation.

Against a courageous and far-seeing President we have ranged all the forces of fascism, nazi-ism, appeasement, and nonintervention. History will record the wisdom of President Roosevelt and the patient efforts of his great Secretary of State in keeping this Nation free. What we do in voting on this important resolution will also be of record.

Within a day or two Japan's special representative will be here. Our action on the pending resolution will convince him, one way or the other, whether we are in fact united against the threat of force or torn by indecision and disunity, as Hitler seeks to prove.

I know that each of us bears a great love for this Nation. It is the greatest nation in all of history and one of the few where democratic principles still govern. Let us not be so foolish as to permit the propaganda of foreign nations to lull us to sleep, as it has other countries.

It is our patriotic duty to consider very carefully whether we are to listen to the propaganda of paid Nazi hirelings, of emotional sympathizers, noninterventionists, appeasers, and believers in totalitarianism, or to instead give heed to a great President, who has only the interests of this Nation at heart, and a Secretary of State, with the benefit of advice from the finest State Department experts on international affairs—all of whom are positive in their belief that it is necessary that this resolution pass.

We know that the resolution will pass. What is now important is that it pass by a large majority. In that way we can give evidence of our unshaken determination to take every means at our command to wipe from the face of the earth the menace of Hitlerism.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorandum by Dr. John L. Coulter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Joseph J. Dunphy, president of the Rhode Island State Society of the District of Columbia, delivered October 30, 1941, over station WINX.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the late Lawrence J. Connery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and insert certain letters written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a speech I delivered last week over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement published yesterday in the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests—to include in the Appendix two editorials from the Marinette Eagle-Star, and also one from the Green Bay Press-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Bonneville Dam. This article will take up three pages of the RECORD, the printer tells me, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of two letters and two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NEUTRALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to commerce with States engaged in armed conflict), and section 3 of such act (relating to combat areas), are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 2. Section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to the arming of American vessels) is hereby repealed; and, during the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, the President is authorized, through such agency as he may designate, to arm, or to permit or cause to be armed, any American vessel as defined in such act. The provisions of section 16 of the Criminal Code (relating to bonds from armed vessels on clearing) shall not apply to any such vessel."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 334, a motion to concur in the Senate amendments just read is pending. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized for 4 hours. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 4 hours on the motion.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one-half the time allotted to me, or 2 hours, be placed under control of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes and I ask that I be not interrupted during the course of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1941, the President transmitted to the Congress a message setting forth the necessity for reexamining and reconsidering certain provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939. Because of the mounting piratical attacks by German submarines and aircraft upon American vessels, there was on the same day introduced in the House a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 237, providing for the immediate repeal of section 6 of that act, which prevented our vessels from defending themselves against such attacks. On October 17 the joint resolution passed the House by a large majority. When this joint resolution was considered in the other body, there was adopted an amendment, also recommended in the President's message, repealing, in addition, sections 2 and 3 of the act. The House is now being called upon to consider whether or not to concur in the Senate amendment.

What is the effect of the Senate amendment? One of the provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939 which it proposes to repeal is section 2. That section contains two principal provisions:

First. It is made unlawful, after the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the act, for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any country named in the proclamation.

Certain exceptions to this prohibition are made in the case of transportation to Canada and Mexico, and to certain ports in this hemisphere, to ports in the southern Pacific and Far East, and to ports in the South Atlantic. The exceptions, other than with respect to transportation to Canada and Mexico, do not apply in any case to transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Second. Section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 makes it unlawful, after the President has issued a proclamation under section 1, to export from the United States to any country named in the proclamation any articles or materials—except copyrighted articles—unless all title thereto and interest therein has been transferred to some foreign government or person. Exceptions similar to those I have just described are also made to this provision. It is to be noted that this provision applies not alone to export on American vessels, but to export on neutral and belligerent vessels as well.

Section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 provides that whenever the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 and thereafter finds that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he is to define combat areas. It is made unlawful, except under such regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or for any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The President is given power to modify or extend any such area.

These, then, are the provisions the repeal of which we are now considering. To me the issues are very plain and very clear. This is now the fourth time that we have had to consider changes in a novel policy embarked upon only 6 years ago. We have called that policy our neutrality law, but it is in fact no such thing. The obligations which it imposes upon the United States and its citizens are obligations not recognized by the law of nations. They are obligations which are imposed by the laws of no other civilized country upon the face of the earth. And they have failed in their purpose. Why? In my opinion the reasons are twofold.

First. These obligations were based upon assumptions which do not exist in the present world war. They presupposed the observance by belligerents of the law of nations, whereas we all know that the gangsters in control of Germany have fought like gangsters and pirates without regard to any law. We cannot isolate ourselves from the truth in this regard. We thought when we prohibited our ships from entering combat zones that they would be safe everywhere else on the seas. Our theory was blasted by Nazi torpedoes sinking our ships thousands of miles from any zone of combat.

This very gangsterism which made the assumptions upon which our neutrality law was enacted untenable has also given rise to the second reason why this law has failed. Many of you will recall stirring addresses on this floor 6 years ago, in which we were urged not to shackle our hands in the face of the unpredictable. We chose not to heed those urgings, but in a mere 6 years' time, because of the

gangsterism that is rampant on the Continent of Europe and its consequent threat to our own security, we have found it necessary to adopt a policy of giving all possible aid to those nations of the world which are compelled to resist this gangsterism by force of arms. At the present time this policy is the principal policy of this Government in relation to foreign affairs. It is a policy which has received the overwhelming support of our people. We have found, however, that, because of shackles which we placed upon ourselves in 1935, we cannot make this policy wholly effective—that these shackles which we thought would promote and protect the security of the United States will, unless unloosed, place that security in grave jeopardy.

Thus we are faced with the necessity of repealing sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939. It should be emphasized that there will still be in effect those provisions of law relating to neutrality under which every President from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt has operated. These provisions were in effect in 1794, they were in effect when the Neutrality Act of 1935 was enacted, and they are in effect today. And yet, despite the fact that all that is proposed is to make our policy consistent and to restore to the present President the same freedom of action that every other President in our history has enjoyed in conducting the foreign relations of the United States—that and no more—it has been charged that the proposed repeal is tantamount to a declaration of war. It is not any such thing. Let us put aside such reckless statements and devote our united efforts to doing what is necessary to make American secure. The proposed repeal is essential to that effort, and for this reason I profoundly hope that the House will concur in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], one-half the time allotted to me, or 2 hours.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, never since I became a Member of Congress have I been so troubled in spirit as in recent days while attempting to bring my mind and conscience together as to the position I should take on the Senate amendments now before us. I have at last, after a struggle with myself, brought them together in the decision that if I am to be true to myself and my people I cannot support this measure as it now stands, because I believe that it means all-out war—total war—with all its implications and all its consequences.

The record will show that to this date I have supported the President in every recommendation he has made to the Congress for implementation by Congress of his announced foreign policy. I have believed that the President does not want to see this country involved in all-out war with an expeditionary force sent to France. I still want to believe that the President does not want to send American boys to fight again on foreign soil and American sailors to die in foreign waters.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I fought hand in hand with our distinguished chairman and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, and the other distinguished Democratic members of our committee for the passage of the noninvolvement acts of 1935, of 1936, and 1937, the Arms Embargo Act of 1937, the repeal of the Arms Embargo Act of 1939. I supported these acts because I believed that their provisions should be stones in the proper structure of our foreign policy. I voted for them because I wanted to help other democracies in every way short of war itself. I voted for these acts because I felt that such steps were for the best interest of the United States and would tend to keep the United States at peace rather than lead us toward war.

This country has always supported the law of nations, commonly called international law. The doctrine of freedom of the seas is a part of international law, and we have asserted our rights under that doctrine up until the year 1935. From that year, under the leadership of our President, Congress in its efforts and desire to keep from sending another expeditionary force to France, realizing that our insistence on the doctrine of freedom of the seas carried us into the last war, embarked on a new policy through the passage of the acts I have mentioned. We asserted our determination to be neutral in foreign wars, if possible, by circumscribing some of the rights of our own citizens under international law. Congress realized by the passage of these acts that we would never keep out of war through insistence on observance of international law by warring nations.

I voted and spoke on the floor of this House in favor of the lend-lease bill. I am so prejudiced in favor of the democracies that I was and am willing to burden this generation and future generations of my country with debt in order to help them. I voted for the lend-lease bill because I believed it was for the best interest of the United States to do so, because I hoped that it would prove that Mr. Churchill's assertion, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job," will prove true. If Members will examine the records, they will find that throughout all the debates on the various neutrality or peace acts, including the lend-lease bill, the main premise upon which the arguments rested was that passage would decrease the chances of the United States becoming involved, would make unnecessary the sending of an expeditionary force to Europe, and thus in helping the democracies to win we would be primarily helping ourselves. Never once did any Member of this House dare to assert that we should enter into all-out war, that we should send an expeditionary force to France, or that we should repeal the combat-zone provisions of existing law.

I detest Hitlerism and all it stands for. I realize that the philosophy and power of Hitlerism may easily become a menace to the United States. I want to help England and her Allies because, if the light of democracy goes out in Europe,

the darkness there may easily spread to this continent. At the same time, my first duty is to my own country, and the fact that I want to help some other nation against an aggressor is of secondary consideration when the welfare of my own country is involved. My position in the past has been the same as that of a great majority of this House and the President himself—to help the democracies by all means short of war.

When the present bill came before our committee it only contained repeal of the prohibition in existing law against arming our merchant ships. I supported the bill in committee and voted for it on the floor of the House. Now the Senate comes with startling amendments, further striking out sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act. These amendments I cannot swallow in good conscience. If these amendments are adopted, it means that the United States goes back once more to utter dependence on international law to insure the peace, when international law has already been raped and stabbed and is gasping for breath. It means that international law will fail as it failed in 1917 and 1918. It means that we will be totally engulfed in the boiling caldron of war. It means that all the noninvolvement acts we passed and all the efforts we made to insure the peace of the future, by the establishment of a new policy while the heads of men and women could think coolly, are to be cast aside. For what? For dependence on international law, for dependence on the doctrine of freedom of the seas. Members know that the cornerstone of the structure of our noninvolvement policy is the prohibition of the entrance of our ships into war zones. Tear that stone away and we reap the whirlwind in our dependence upon a light that has already failed.

Oh, my friends, those who proposed these Senate amendments to the Neutrality Act must know that passage of these amendments means war. Knowing that, how much more honest and courageous it would have been to bring here a straight-out declaration of war and let us face the issue without any camouflage, without any smoke screen to hide behind should we be called to account by our constituents. As for me, I would vote just as readily for a declaration of war as I would for these amendments. At least, then, I would not feel like a dodging, groveling hypocrite.

Members talk here today about international law, when there is no international law. The time to talk about international law is before war comes, not after it has started. War itself is against international law, was made so by the Kellogg-Briand Pact, outlawing war. No belligerents adhere to international law when by so doing they endanger the success of their fighting plans.

Members have talked about freedom of the seas. There is no such thing as freedom of the seas in belligerent waters. Freedom of the seas in time of war is what nations that control the seas say it is and nothing more. Realizing the fallacy of depending alone upon international law and the doctrine of freedom of the seas to preserve the peace, Con-

gress has embarked on a policy of implementing international law by legislation. We did not repudiate international—we supplemented it. If in so doing we have acted unneutrally against some belligerent power, if we have deprived some of our own citizens of heretofore acknowledged rights on the seas, that is a matter of secondary consideration. I do not pretend to be neutral in my sympathies as to sides in this war. There is little or no neutrality in this Congress when it comes to heart and sympathy. I would say that 99 percent of the people in my congressional district and in my State want the democracies to win. I join, from the bottom of my soul, in that wish. I have done everything I could to help them without going into all-out war, but the adoption of this report means all-out war. I am not ready to vote for that step yet.

Should the combat area provisions be stricken from the noninvolvement act by this Congress, the President may well consider such action to be a mandate from Congress to go full steam ahead into the very jaws of the conflict. He could not interpret such action otherwise. It will not be the President who must bear the responsibility—it will rest on the shoulders of Congress, and we cannot dodge and squirm and excuse ourselves.

But some say we have gone this far and are now committed to go all the way. I disagree with that position. I may support with my money, my property, and my substance a good neighbor who believes in my ideals against the bad neighbor who will possibly and probably give me trouble later on. It may be proper to give him all I have; it may be proper to mortgage the future security of my children to help him, but the laws of nations, the rules of humanity, the good conscience of individuals could not expect me to go further than that if such steps call for the blood of my children.

Yes; I realize that Hitler has outraged the laws of humanity. I realize that we have been unneutral and have gone a long way to help those who oppose him with their blood. I realize that if he conquers Europe, the chances are we will have trouble with him sooner or later. I fully realize that we may be called upon to vote for or against a war resolution next week or next month or next year. I am ready to meet the issue when it comes, but let it come in a straightforward way and not through the back door. I am unalterably opposed to going into this war by subterfuge. Our people who are to make the untold sacrifices should know what it is all about. If we send our merchant ships into these combat zones, would it not be cowardly not to send our battleships to protect them? And if we send our battleships in to protect them, do you not know that many will be sunk? Do you not know that thousands of American boys' lives will be lost? Do you not know that then, with the multiplicity of incidents, the cry will go out, and will be heeded, to send an American expeditionary force to France? Do you not realize that then there must follow total war; that successful operation of that war calls for a unified command; that this country will no longer be master of its own destiny; that the

commander in chief of the land forces will come from the British Army; that our soldiers will and must be ordered not only to Iceland but to England, to Africa, to Asia—to the far corners of the earth, many to never come back, many to come back broken in soul and body and spirit? We are at the brink of the chasm, and if we must jump, let us do so with our eyes straight ahead and with full knowledge of the consequences. What will it profit the United States to be forced to send an expeditionary force of half-trained soldiers to Europe again? Down in my congressional district in South Carolina, Army maneuvers are being conducted to prepare our Army for any eventuality. Four hundred thousand boys, coming from every State in the Union, almost, the pick of American youth, are preparing there for the call, wherever it may be. They are not prepared, they are not fully trained, they are not fully equipped with tanks and guns, they have not yet been hardened to the life of camp and field, but their spirit is fine and their morale could not be beat, regardless of rumors to the contrary. Must we send them to some foreign port before they are prepared, as we did the boys in 1917 and 1918? It would be suicide and would not benefit the belligerent democracies, other than to assure them of our total involvement to a point where we could not turn back. If we go all the way now, it is our duty to divert war supplies from England to our own troops. From reports we have received, not half of the English troops yet are fully equipped. Would it help England for us to go all-out into this war now when the world knows that our nonbelligerence is the sole thing that is holding Japan back from attacking English possessions in the Pacific? Would it help Britain, her allies, or the United States to be placed in such a position in the Atlantic that it will be impossible for her to efficiently act to preserve the status quo in the Pacific? No, my friends, we are now mortgaging the future of our children to provide England with the tools she said were necessary to win this war, and England must show a will to use them to the limit before we should send our sons to bleed and die.

Mr. Speaker, I must make one further statement as to how far, in my humble opinion, our national defense plans should go, as to where our outermost defense lines should be placed and manned. Some think that one of our frontiers is the Rhine; some say our first defense line is the English Channel; some say the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans; some have been so narrow in their conception of a proper national defense to take the position that the first defense lines of the United States should be the shores of the United States and that there we should sit prepared, maybe, waiting for the enemy to strike before lifting a hand. I take no such position. I have taken the position on this floor, and I reiterate that position now, that if it is necessary for the defense of the United States, our defense lines should be established anywhere on the face of the globe where it is necessary to take our stand or to shed our blood in behalf of our country. If I thought it best for the national existence of the United

States to send an American expeditionary force to Europe at this time, I would vote to send it there. Down in my heart I cannot help but believe that the greatest tragedy we could commit would be to send our boys away again, except as a last resort, unless fully prepared and trained, and without an open, frank, straight-out declaration of all-out war. Then our people would understand, then they would know the responsibilities and dangers they must face, then they would know the sacrifices they must make, then they would meet the call. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress will save their consciences, after they vote for the Senate amendments, by asserting that our foreign policy has been established by our President, that it is too late now to turn back. This is our responsibility, not the President's. I realize that the President has had a great hand in shaping our foreign policy and carrying it out under the Constitution. But the law of the land now, recommended by the President and passed by Congress, is that our ships cannot go into belligerent waters. That law was passed because we knew that entrance of our ships into these danger zones could only lead to war. Congress established that policy through the recommendation of the President and now the issue is whether or not Congress will reverse it. Oh, yes; the President has his responsibility, and a great responsibility, and I feel for him; but this vote, this act, this step, is a responsibility that Congress cannot shirk, that its Members must carry on their own shoulders, not only now but as long as we live. I cannot help but believe that this fatal step, once taken, will in the long-run be detrimental to the United States. If through some false steps of ours now the United States is finally destroyed from without or within, I do not want to be a party to it.

Mr. Speaker, I heard last week a great address in the Senate by Senator TYNINGS, of Maryland, who was an officer and had a great record in the last World War. He spoke with understandable and modest pride of his old division and the sacrifices his men made for their country for \$33 per month pay for foreign service, of their disappointment and bitterness and disillusionment, not because of the small pay they received but because of the squabbling at home as to whether men there should receive one or two dollars per hour or two hundred or two hundred and fifty dollars per month for manufacturing the guns and ammunition which they never received until the war was over; or because some manufacturing concern dared to hold up production of war materials until it could secure its pound of flesh in the way of 100-percent profits. As I listened to the Senator my mind went back to my old division, the Thirtieth, and the men who shouldered the rifle and fought and died under its banner. We had a pretty good division, we thought; some said the best. My regiment, the old One Hundred and Eighteenth Infantry, was made up of men who believed in the justice of our cause. They must have believed in our cause, for that regiment received more Congressional Medals for individual valor and heroism

beyond the call of duty than any other regiment in the armed forces of the United States. I am proud that I served with the Thirtieth throughout the conflict as a private and a sergeant for \$33 and \$44 per month. I did not feel then, and I do not feel now, that I was underpaid for what little I could do. Our division, after training in this country for 1 year, saw foreign service under the British along with the Twenty-seventh Division of New York at Ypres, on the Somme River, at St. Quentin, Cambreil, and Bellicourt. The Twenty-seventh and Thirtieth first broke the Hindenburg line. Many of our men, hundreds and hundreds of them, paid the supreme sacrifice. They fought with British artillery, British and French machine guns, with British planes overhead. They were under the command of a British general, and had it not been for "Blackjack" Pershing, the men of our organization would have been torn from American command and fed into British units to be used as cannon fodder under the British flag. They felt about it all just as Senator TYDINGS' men felt. Sweaters and socks sent by the good women of our country—God bless them—are not all that the men at the front need in a war. They need most of all the united unselfish support of every activity of their country, including labor, capital, and industry. There must be sacrifice somewhere else beside the battle line, and we will never get that necessary spirit of sacrifice on the front or elsewhere by plunging this Nation into war by a cowardly policy here in Congress. To wage war as war is waged today everyone must sacrifice, and the American people have not the slightest idea of the extent of the sacrifices they must be called upon to bear. If we are going to go into this war by means of these amendments or otherwise, we should first strip our decks for action, not during the battle, but before it. Are we going blindly forward to win a victory for the world and at the same time confess by inaction at home that we are unable to handle traitors here, be they labor leaders or industrial giants? I say this country is not ready for war and will never be ready until we clear our decks at home.

Mr. Speaker, in this solemn hour I am thinking about what is best for my country. I am thinking of the mothers of this country; I am thinking of the thousands and thousands of mothers' sons who may be sent to foreign soil and foreign seas and never come back; I am thinking of the wounded and the broken who may come back in future years to plead to another Congress for a just verdict on their cause, for a miserable pittance, known as a pension, to help keep broken bones and shattered spirit together; I am thinking of how Congress, in a moment of grand sentimentality, without realizing the mockery of it all, will direct the gathering up of a handful of dust and bones from Dakar, or Alexandria, or Leningrad, or Singapore, and have them brought here to be encased in another monument to the unknown soldier with the inscription "here lies in honored glory an American soldier known only to God." To that beautiful inscription there should, but will not, be added these words

"sent to his death in a foreign land, through the back door, by Congress before he was properly armed or properly trained and without the undivided support of the people back home." I have no son old enough to go. My oldest is only 13 years. I have always tried to teach my sons to believe in the immortal words of Commodore Decatur, "My country in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right but, right or wrong, my country." If the time ever comes when their Nation needs them on the battlefield and they do not want to go, I would hide my face in shame. But when that time comes, when the Nation calls, I want the call to come clear, clear, honest, and direct from Congress; I want them to understand; and I want them to face the issue with prayer on their lips and a smile in their soul, and with an unconquerable belief in the justice of their cause. May they never be called to battle untrained, half armed, and in a haze of doubt because of a divided nation behind them; may they never have cause for belief that their country sent them to foreign battlefields through subterfuge and indirection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard and affectionate esteem for the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who has just addressed the House. I know that he is genuinely sincere in the conclusion he has reached. I regret very much, however, that the gentleman has seen proper to take this step, because I believe the step which he takes at this time is a mistake, in the defense of our country.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, the grave responsibility which rests upon the House in the consideration of this resolution. Viewed in the light of existing conditions and the grave danger which confronts our country at this hour, both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, in my judgment, the immediate passage of this resolution with the Senate amendments is imperatively necessary for the defense of our country. Its passage, according to our military and naval experts, would strengthen and make more effective our defense. Its defeat, according to those same experts, would weaken, impair, and still further impede our defense. The defeat of this measure would not only weaken our own defense, but it will give aid and comfort and encouragement to the dictators both in Europe and in the Orient. Aside from the practical aid which they would receive from the defeat of this measure, and the still further hampering of the movement of our ships, the psychological effect abroad of the defeat of this measure will produce repercussions, the magnitude of which no one can foretell.

Instead of believing, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] believes, that the passage of this resolution means immediate war, I believe on the contrary, that its defeat will bring us into war much quicker. I think I speak the views of those who are charged with the defense of our country when I voice those views. I refer not only to those in our State Department but I refer to those in

the Army and the Navy who are charged with the defense of our country.

The speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is all predicated upon an assumption. The gentleman assumes that the passage of this resolution means immediate war and that our country is not prepared for immediate war, and therefore the gentleman would vote against it. Let us stop and analyze that conclusion. I say that it is not justified; and I say that a clear analysis and reasoning will not cause anyone to reach that conclusion. When we passed the lend-lease bill for which the gentleman voted and in support of which he made a very able speech—as he always does in the case of any measure he advocates—I say the passage of the lend-lease resolution was a declaration of policy that the United States would spend billions of dollars to defeat Hitler. That came much nearer being a war measure than this measure which is an incidental supplement of our own defense. If the passage of this measure is going to offend Mr. Hitler, how much more offense did the passage of the lend-lease bill afford him, a bill which pledged the policy of this country to give billions of dollars to defeat him? If that did not produce war, who will say that the mere amendment of our neutrality law by which we give our ships the right they have always had, and which every other major country and minor country of the world has, is going to bring on war?

I abhor war, I despise war; but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a discussion of the virtues and vices of war is not going to help you reach a right conclusion in the consideration of this resolution. Concede everything that the gentleman said, that our country is not prepared for war, it does not mean that just because we pass this resolution we will go to war. Why do they say that this measure is a subterfuge that takes us into war? I have heard no one yet say why. I have heard other speakers state this same conclusion, but not one of them has fortified his conclusion by any fact. Why will it take us into war?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not now.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am going to answer; I am going to answer that before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. KEEFE. But the gentleman asked a question. I want to answer him.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman will hear what I have to say if he will keep quiet.

Here is what they say off the floor. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina himself did not say it, but he simply jumped to that conclusion. Let us analyze it. Will it produce war? Why, they voted to arm our ships, so that is not involved; I am not going to discuss that. The only matter we have now pending, I assume, is the amendments of the Senate which relate to section 2 and section 3. What are these sections? Section 2 of the present neutrality law provides that we may not send our merchant ships—that American ships under the American flag shall not carry any

goods or persons—to any country named in the President's proclamation which countries are at war. When did we put that in the neutrality law? We passed the original neutrality law in 1935. It had nothing of that kind in it. We passed a neutrality law in 1936. It had no such provision. We passed a neutrality law in 1937, and that law had this provision—that it shall be unlawful for American ships to carry arms, munitions, and implements of war to belligerent countries. But the present act which we are now seeking to amend, passed in 1939, went beyond that and provided not only an inhibition against the carrying of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries, but it provided that no American ship should carry any article, any goods, or any persons to belligerent nations; in other words, it placed a complete embargo upon the American ships under the American flag to go into foreign ports of all belligerent countries. Section 3 gave the President the power, in addition to that, to define additional zones where ships could not go; in other words, automatically to place an inhibition against the carrying of goods to any warring country; whereas section 3 gives the President the power to extend that danger zone still further and restrict ships from going into those zones which he conceives to be dangerous.

Now, let us see who says that will stand as a barrier to our present policy, and what is that policy? That policy is that we have reached the deliberate conclusion—not the President, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, but the Congress of the United States, with his vote and with a large majority of votes in this House and in the Senate—reached the conclusion and determination that the United States of America was in danger, and that in order to meet that danger it was our duty to give material aid in an unlimited amount to the democracies who were fighting to defeat Hitler. Why? Not for their benefit but for our own benefit.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I would rather get through. I will yield to my friend when I get through.

At that time the neutrality law had been passed; long before that, in 1939. What is there about the neutrality law that makes it so sacred that if you touch it or if you repeal it or if you modify it, it means war? I am afraid my friend from South Carolina, like some of these other folks, has been reading so many letters from people stating that repeal of the neutrality law means war, that they have become obsessed with the idea that you can insure peace by legislation and that the neutrality law is an insurance policy against war. Why, Mr. Speaker, there was never such a false or fallacious view as that. War is not produced by legislation.

Here is the situation in which the Congress finds itself. We have a law and a policy by which we have said that we must give aid, we must send materials, we must send food, munitions, and various articles to these democracies. Since we have passed that law, what has hap-

pened? We have been challenged. Our right to do that has been challenged by Adolf Hitler and his associates.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I would rather wait.

There is the situation. When we passed that law we said we wanted to give that aid. What did Mr. Hitler do? He sent out his horde of submarines. He did more than that. He drew himself a danger zone, not by any authority of international law but by his own edict, a vast space in the ocean 1,600 by 1,800 miles, and he said, "You shall not come within those waters." He did not stop there. He sent his submarines not simply in his own waters, not in belligerent waters, as my friend from South Carolina said, but to nonbelligerent waters. He came into waters that Hitler had no right to come into and sunk our merchant vessels when they were upon peaceful missions. He sunk ship after ship carrying munitions, supplies, and food.

Some one has asked—I think it was the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina—"What is the use of appropriating \$13,000,000,000 to send supplies if those supplies cannot reach those for whom intended?" That is the test as it finally comes down to us at this time.

The gentleman spoke of subterfuges, and I abhor subterfuges. But there is a subterfuge that is having to be practiced now because this law is in effect, by which American ships sail the seas, not under the American flag but under the Panamanian flag.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not now. That is the subterfuge we want to eliminate. I have always believed that the United States of America was big enough and courageous enough to sail its ships under its own flag; but because of this law that we are trying to get out of the way now we have had to sneak down, borrowing the gentleman's language, to Panama and say, "Please, Mr. Panama, lend us your flag. We cannot violate our laws, so let us fly your flag." I am for the repeal of that provision because I want America returned to the old-time policy of flying the Stars and Stripes over every ship it sends, either in the Atlantic or in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will when I finish.

The neutrality law was passed when we thought that there would be a war between some countries, but we did not realize at that time that there would be war in practically all countries, that there would be war in all the world, and that this war would not only be intended against the countries fighting but would be aimed by the one who was promoting it at the United States of America.

We have two laws now. We have this neutrality law that interferes and impedes our defense, according to our military and naval experts, and whom can we trust when they are charged with our defense? Furthermore, it impedes our

defense—I do not think this has been mentioned before—with reference not only to the exportation of our materials to foreign countries with whom we are allied and with whom we are trying to help, but it impedes our own defense in bringing in strategic materials, strategic fighter materials, unless we can use our own ships to sail the seas and bring them in. There is tin, manganese, chromium, rubber, and various other commodities that we must have in connection with the manufacture of steel and in connection with the manufacture of other commodities. Some of these come from the Dutch East Indies, some from the Malay States, some from various other countries. If the war should spread into the Pacific, which seems probable, then under this law we would be stopped, we would be hamstrung; we could not bring in the materials that we would have to have and need in the production of our defense weapons.

Someone suggests that we could then amend the law. How long would it take to do that? We passed this bill 4 weeks ago day after tomorrow. It has been nearly 1 month since it was passed. We would have to wait for 1 month at least, and many things could happen in 1 month. We have seen from the beginning of this conflict how much is wrought overnight. We have gone to bed one night and a country was under one flag and when we awoke next morning that peaceful country that we thought was at peace was under the flag of the dictator, Hitler. We have seen history transformed and maps remade rapidly and quickly.

One of the gentlemen who spoke against this bill in another body said that it went too far, too fast. That was his reason for opposing it. I imagine, Mr. Speaker, if these 20 or more governments that have fallen could bear testimony here today the reason they would give as to why they had fallen would be that in the preparation of their defense they had not gone far enough quickly enough. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is necessary now to aid us in carrying the supplies to the countries that are fighting this war. We say it is necessary for our own defense, and I say it is necessary to enable us to bring the strategic, vital materials into our own land which are necessary in the manufacture of munitions and supplies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I promised the gentleman I would yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman stated, if I understood him correctly, that war is not produced or stopped by legislation.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Right.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe, as the President has repeatedly stated, that it is frequently and usually produced by provocative incidents?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman so believe?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will answer the gentleman if he will wait to let me answer him.

Mr. KEEFE. All right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I do believe that provocative incidents have in the past much to do with producing war, but let me say right there that that is the assumption the gentlemen opposing this bill indulge in, that provocative incidents bring on war. Let me cite to the gentleman the fact that the American people have not permitted provocative incidents in this crisis to bring on war, because they have sunk our ships, they have sunk our destroyers, and they have taken the lives of our men upon the high seas, yet we have so steeled ourselves against war that we have not permitted ourselves to go to war. If we permit these ships to be armed and to go into these ports, if it would not bring on war when we had the Neutrality Act on the statute books, why would it bring on war if we permit them to go lawfully into those ports under the American flag? If the sinking of ships has not brought on war why will more sinkings cause it?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman answer one further question, if I may expect an answer to the question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Surely.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate in his remarks why this Nation does not continue the lease-lend policy and deliver these ships to England itself or to any of the other democracies fighting totalitarian aggression, and allow them to carry all the lease-lend material themselves, as they are now doing in abundance, without sailing ships flying the Stars and Stripes, manned by American seamen, into combat zones and into the ports of belligerent nations? Will the gentleman explain why?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Surely I shall explain. If my friend had been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and had heard Admiral Land and Admiral Stark and others, he would have heard—and he can read in the hearings—a letter that was addressed to me from Admiral Land, as well as one from Admiral Stark. The question had been asked, "Why should we not turn our ships over to England and let England man the ships?" These officials said that there were two good reasons for not doing so. One is that we do not want to surrender the control of our ships to any other country, because sometimes we may want the ships to go to one country and sometimes to another country. The other reason is that Britain does not have the manpower to man these ships, that they are pressed for manpower in the operation of ships, and that they were then drafting women to carry on work that men ordinarily had to do; that there was a shortage of manpower. I may say to the gentleman that that question was explored and fully investigated, and it will not wash, because the conditions will not permit it and will not justify it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. As I understand, the gentleman believes that the repeal of sections 2 and 3, as provided in the Senate amendment, is essential to our national welfare. Why did the gentleman and his committee not provide for such repeal when, less than a month ago, they reported this bill to the House?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I shall be glad to answer that question, I may say to my friend from Georgia.

The Secretary of State—and I am sure that Secretary Hull has the confidence of my good friend from Georgia, who served with him in the House—in a discussion of the question, said that the repeal of section 2 was just as important as the repeal of section 6, which relates to arming ships. However, it takes a longer time to arm ships than it does to sail them into different zones. For instance, if we have to arm our merchant vessels, that cannot be done overnight. It would take time if they were all in port, but they are not all in port at the same time. We have to wait until their return.

The President's message, which was read from that desk, called attention to the importance of the repeal of both these sections, but we thought that in the interest of time and speed it was necessary to pass the first one first, and instead of encumbering it with the second we adopted the single measure with reference to section 6.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This was the situation. We realized that that would have to be done, but we thought that it would take time to repeal both sections and it would take much more time to arm the ships than it would to send these ships into the danger zones, so we passed it in that shape. The Senate committee considered the matter for a week in the light of the conditions that had arisen. If the gentleman will refer to the Senate hearings, he will find that the last witness who appeared before the Senate committee was Dr. Eliot, of the O. P. M., who is connected with Harvard University. I believe that it was upon his testimony that the Senate decided to enlarge that bill and include this other section as well, because it shows just the point I made a moment ago, that the present law crippled our importing strategic material from other ports.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point so that I may include a further explanation of how our program is being impeded by the importation of strategic materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. My good and distinguished friend from Texas has been speaking, and very ably, on the premise that it is imperative that we furnish this shipping to get implements of war to Great Britain. Has the gentleman read

the report of Winston Churchill to Parliament yesterday on that very subject?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I may say to my friend that I have not. I know, however, that I am basing my statement not on what Winston Churchill has said but upon what our own military and naval experts, Admiral Stark and Admiral Land, say, and they say it is necessary. I am following their judgment because they are the ones who determine the matter of our defense.

Mr. RICHARDS. Has the gentleman read this report of Winston Churchill to Parliament, in which he said:

1. In 1943 we shall have sufficient shipping to undertake overseas operations.
2. Almost 1,000,000 tons of Axis shipping were sent to the bottom or damaged seriously in the 4 months ending in October.
3. During that same period Britain's shipping losses dropped almost two-thirds.

In view of this report by the great leader of a great belligerent nation, does the gentleman believe it is imperative now for us to send our American ships for his own warfare?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will ask the gentleman a question—

Mr. RICHARDS. No; I want the gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman want our ships to operate under the American flag or the Panamanian flag?

Mr. RICHARDS. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the figures vary as to sinkings, and some months they are more and some months they are less; and, possibly, last month they did not sink quite so many; but the volume of tonnage sunk has jeopardized the defense of Britain and jeopardized our defense; and that is what our naval experts now say; and will my friend now tell me whether he wants the American flag or the Panamanian flag?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have already told the gentleman—just a few minutes ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, this will probably be the shortest speech made in this debate, and there will be no extension of remarks by me. I want to say merely that I am again speaking to you as one who still has vivid recollections of what service in France meant. I am telling you this afternoon that this legislation now before us is the most cowardly, the most dastardly, the most underhanded method of getting us into this war through the back door.

I hope we shall never have a war resolution to vote upon, but I fear shortly we may. The proper and only way to handle the international situation is the honest way, and that is to submit a war resolution to this House for a vote. The present method, I say again, Mr. Speaker, is cowardly and nothing else. I am very much opposed to it and shall vote against it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH] an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I find myself today in a rather difficult situation. My friend, the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] who has worked so faithfully and so well for a cause which he believes to be vital to the best interests of this country, the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is leading the fight in the Senate so ably and so well, most of my Texas colleagues, doubtless, although I have not talked with many of them about it, are following their able leadership. And yet, as I have taken counsel with myself, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, I finally arrived at this conclusion, not that it is so important or that it will influence your decision, or your vote in this matter. The people who sent me to Congress some years ago and have continued sending me here, are entitled to know, first, how I stand on this vital proposition and, second, what my reasons are for standing there. It is for this reason I find myself standing before you discussing this measure, not from a prepared statement, because I have no prepared statement; not for newspapers to headline, because little attention will be paid to what I am about to say, but because these people are entitled to know.

I have supported the administration's foreign policy step by step, measure by measure, without faltering. We have been told time and time again that each measure which we adopted was in the interest of peace. I am not going to be dishonest about it. I have not always believed that to be true, but I did have the hope that we would not be drawn into this war. I believed then, as I believe now, that Hitler is a menace to our country and to many other countries—do not misunderstand me on that—and I believe that we have a responsibility as a great industrial nation, as a free people, as a mighty people, which we ought to discharge. But, Mr. Speaker, we, the American people, we the Representatives of the American people in Congress, are going to have to retain in our own hands the reins, so to speak, and we are going to have to say what that responsibility is, where it begins and where it ends. My belief is that during the past few months we are surrendering that right. I am not basing this statement altogether on what has happened since the war clouds began to gather a few years ago. I am basing it in part upon what has happened during similar times in past years. So I find myself today confronted with this proposition. We are most surely drifting step by step toward active participation in this great world conflict. I notice where some gentlemen representing the Free French made this statement this morning. Time and time again Mr. Churchill and others in England have assured their people that America is lining up and coming nearer and nearer to the brink of war.

No sensible man who wants to be honest can deny that fact, and so we must determine today what price we are willing to pay in an effort to discharge our responsibilities. Here is the price that I am willing to pay, and it is no

small one. I have followed the leadership of this Congress and of this administration cheerfully through all the billions of dollars that have been appropriated to manufacture war materials in order to undertake to stop Hitler, and I am willing to continue to do that thing, but I am not willing to take this step which is most assuredly another step leading us nearer to war. It may mean the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands, and probably millions, of American lives. Let us not fool ourselves.

Some of my people and your people say that this man Hitler is a madman and that he must be stopped. As I have already said, he is a definite menace, but the American people who tell you he must be stopped by us have not counted the cost. Yes; I would like to stop him, but I am not willing to send that little boy who takes me by the hand and calls me "daddy." I am not willing today to throw the life of that boy in front of Hitler's great war machine; and not being willing to do that, Mr. Speaker, in my responsibility as a Representative, I am not willing to send my neighbor's boy to a foreign battlefield to try to stop Hitler. This thing has done much to cause me to make up my mind, and I confess I did not arrive at a definite decision until very recently. I have heard the news reports, I have eagerly listened to able commentators, and I have read speeches and magazines anxiously to find the answer to these questions: "What is England doing?" "What is she going to do?" When Germany marched into Russia I said, "Surely this is a godsend for the democracies," and Russia has offered much more resistance than I hoped at that time. I said that surely when 50 percent or more of this greatest war machine that has ever been built up is in use against the Russian people, then England, whose life is so much imperiled, will move in and sacrifice men and materials and perhaps we will see a change. But, what has happened? The Russian people have spilled the blood of some four or five millions of their bravest sons, and Germany has sacrificed a smaller number, I am afraid. But England has done practically the same thing during these perilous weeks that she did before her enemy was thus engaged. Is not that a fact? Well, before we are called upon to sacrifice not only the materials and resources of this country but our manpower as well, to save that noble and brave little country of England, I say to you that England ought to move in without fear and without reserve and make a much greater sacrifice to save herself before she asks the American people to become an active partner. Have you thought about that? Before God I am afraid that if America were to move in, great country that she is, and nobody knows our strength better than England, I am afraid that with Russia, fighting on the one front and with America definitely in the war, the English people would want to pretty much sit back and referee the fight. I mean that.

We are in our swaddling clothes in the matter of high-powered diplomacy as compared with the British people, probably the greatest and smartest nation on

earth in the matter of diplomacy; and as I take up my paper from day to day and see where Mr. Churchill, great and fine and brave as he is, has said so and so—and I read his every statement—I cannot but say in my own heart and mind, "these are words for the purpose of drawing the American people into the conflict." And, once that has been done, England will breathe a sigh of relief, the like of which she has not been able to breathe for 2 years. My friends will say that I am getting out on a limb. I do not know about that. It is not very important whether any single Member of this House is returned to the House or not. I am not issuing any challenges. I am simply saying to you that I think I have counted the cost; I think I have considered this thing honest and rationally. But they talk about stopping Hitler's war machine with a million and a half beardless boys, poorly trained and with insufficient equipment, when Russia has already lost more equipment in these few weeks than this country has turned out since the day of its beginning. Think about that. I doubt if this country has manufactured as much war material as that great German Army has ground into the dust in the past few weeks in Russia. On the plains of Russia today there are more dead Russian soldiers who were well trained than this country could send to Europe in the next 3 years. And yet some of the uninformed continue to say that we must stop Hitler. Let us not undertake to stop him until we have counted the cost.

I believe that if America will be as smart as the British, from the standpoint of diplomacy, Germany will be defeated ultimately, and America will not need to sacrifice any lives on foreign battlefields. Now, how is this going to happen? This is a war of resources, of machines, planes, tanks, and guns, and Germany has made enormous inroads on her resources. But it is not going to happen by invading the Continent. This is another thing which has caused me to lie awake at night. When I read what some of these war experts in England and America are saying, "You cannot whip Germany until you invade the Continent," and when I find that Germany has some 8,000,000 well-trained men, the best-equipped soldiers in the world; that England can probably raise four and a half million men, I want to know where the others are coming from. Mark you, the continent of Europe cannot be invaded man for man. Eight million men sent there without full and complete equipment cannot defeat 8,000,000 Germans on the home soil fully equipped. So if you are to invade Germany, it will take not less than twelve or fifteen million men to do it, and two-thirds of them, when the show-down comes, would be American boys. I cannot see any escape in the world from the loss of four or five or six million men if we let others outsmart us, as I am afraid we are doing, and push us into this war to do their fighting.

So I say again I am not willing to pay that price. It is not worth it. But the alarmists and interventionists say this: "You had better get in and fight Hitler today," or what?—because I am interested in that—"or you may have to fight

him 2 years or 10 years, or 20 years hence." If you were to come to me and say, "If you do not give me \$100 today, you may have to give me \$100 next year, or 2 years, or 5 years from now," I would say, "Well, brother, I will sweat it out with you." But if you came to me and said, "If you do not give me \$1 this afternoon, it will cost you \$100 next Saturday," I would say, "Take the dollar." That is, if I did not resent that type of racketeering, which I suspect I would; but I am talking about a pure business proposition. So if my friends who are so scared had said to me, "If you do not get in and fight Hitler today you are going to have to fight him later when he will be comparatively stronger," then you would have a different situation. But no rational man would say that. No country in the world is preparing her defense as rapidly and effectively today as America. Hitler has already consumed much of his materials and supplies, whereas we have just started.

Now, is that not common sense? Who is the first person who said, "This is as much our war as anyone's"? It was not an American. It was an Englishman who is being paid to spread that sort of propaganda. Am I mad at him? No. My hat is off to him, because he is smart. But if I did not hold onto my chair when these high-powered salesmen come into my office to sell automobiles and insurance, and so on, pretty soon my checks would be turned down at the bank. The English people, in my opinion, today, ladies and gentlemen, are spending more money to help America make up her mind to enter this war in this crucial hour than they are in trying to help Russia, who is being so sorely besieged.

I may be wrong, but I believe that, and I must act here not upon what somebody else has said, because he may be repeating what someone who is in distress has said. I must be governed by what my best judgment tells me. It is upon that ground I am standing today.

Mr. Speaker, Germany does not want to fight America now. Is there anybody who will dispute that? Why do I say that? Not because she likes us. She does not. I can well see why. We do not like Germany, and they do not like us, and we understand each other perfectly in that respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, Germany does not want to fight us now because she has her hands full. That is the reason, and the only reason. Well, I do not want to fight Germany. Germany does not want to fight the country I represent. Therefore my course is clear—to not take another step toward war. May I say in opposing this resolution and making this statement today I am doing it for two purposes: First, because I realize that the resolution is a definite step toward war; and, second, because I know it is time that we were calling a halt. I suspect we ought to have done it before now, but not having done it before I am willing to do it now.

I hope the American people will get their feet on the ground and stop following somebody else. You know there are two bad precedents here—much as I love this House, and I say this hesitatingly, but I say it for the benefit of some of the Members who have come in since I came—there are two mistakes we make: First, we want to conform, we do not want anybody to frown upon us for kicking over the traces; and that is a bad situation; that means government by one or a few at least. And, second, although we are not as guilty as the public believes us to be, we cannot quite lose sight of the next election. Now, let us do two or three things: Let us tell England, "You are in distress and we are sorry for you and we are going on an all-out program of supplying food, medicine, clothing, and war materials for you. Now get in there and fight like hell yourselves for awhile and then we will see what, if anything else, ought to be done." Let us forget politics for the moment and vote for what we individually believe to be the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one-half minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, in all the years I have been a Member of this illustrious body I have never observed such a universal solemnity and sense of responsibility on the part of individual Members, regardless of their position on this legislation; and I think this is a very hopeful and fine sign of the quality of their intelligence and conscience. I am glad to see even among those with whom I do not agree that same splendid sense of obligation, duty, and responsibility.

I regret that the gentleman from Texas who has just taken his seat, in his indictment of that slacker nation, Great Britain, left out one of the most appalling pieces of propaganda we have had recently, and which was brought to light by a very distinguished gentleman in another body when he pointed out that Great Britain had actually sent over to this country some little toy soldiers to debauch our babies and bewilder their mothers. With that iniquity piled on the others that the gentleman from Texas has outlined here today, what chance is there for England or anybody associated with her?

Mr. Speaker, in the fateful year of 1939, when this legislation was before the House, I spoke against it and I voted against it; and I spoke and voted against it for two main reasons: One was that I believed, in the face of an impending world conflagration, creating every day unpredictable situations affecting our safety, that it was folly, if not worse, for us to tie the hands of our Government and our people by this piece of grave-clothes legislation; and, in the second place, knowing the American people as I do, I objected to this legislation because I was thoroughly convinced that it would lead to a tremendous confusion and disunity in the public mind at the

very time when we ought to be united; and the proof of that is apparent at this moment, when the country is in a condition of hysteria and disunity, anxiety and heart searching, based practically upon and caused practically by this very legislation, and by no other.

I suggested in my speech—and you will excuse my resurrecting the dead this way—I suggested in my speech that we retain the preamble with reference to international law; that we retain the section which created the Munitions Board; that we retain the section which repealed all existing neutrality legislation, and let it go at that. My efforts, of course, resulted in exactly nothing. But here we are today, Mr. Speaker, tearing our hearts out and disturbing our consciences and our minds in an attempt to get rid of some of these grave clothes. In accordance with my vote against the bill itself, I voted the other day to get rid of section 6; and if God spares me, I am going to vote tomorrow to get rid of sections 2 and 3.

Now, if you will bear with me, I want to call attention to some very fundamental facts here today as far as my poor powers will permit.

A gentleman for whom I have genuine affection made the suggestion that we get into World War No. 1, were carried into it, in fact, by the incidents of the sinking of our ships. I want to go on record here, however, as I have a thousand times in this country, by stating that we were not carried into that war because they sank our ships. I do not believe in the old Roman motto: *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*; that is, after the event all that occurs is a result of the event. We went into that war for one of the greatest spiritual reasons that this world contains. It was the thrust, the irresistible thrust of the American genius and will to be free, expressing itself, at any cost, against the slave master and the whiplash he was determined to lay upon the backs of his conquered fellows.

Ever since the dawn of time the supreme struggle by which men have progressed is a struggle between freedom and slavery. There have been chosen races in the world devoted to the one side or the other. When God called the Hebrew people into being He charged them with the responsibility of carrying to mankind the greatest and most pure religion the world has ever seen. When the Greek people were called into being He charged them with creating the art genius of mankind. When the Roman people took the throne they were charged with the responsibility of laying the foundations of law as the basis of civilization. And when the English-speaking races were born on this continent and in the Old World they were charged by God Almighty to carry the banner of human freedom to the end of time. That is what we, who are the chosen exemplars and guardians of freedom, have got to do now, and always, at any cost.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have this strange situation. I respect the sincerity and wisdom of those who hold that view, but we have the proposition urged with conviction and fervor that this little, picaresque, pusillanimous legislation has kept us out of war, and if we continue it

intact, it will continue to keep us out of war. All right. Let us examine the facts.

Two years ago, with this legislation on the books guaranteed to keep us out of war, we started the greatest program of armed defense the world has ever seen. We planned and called for the greatest Navy in the world, a two-ocean Navy. We planned and called for and are building the greatest air force in the world. We planned and are developing a great Army—that is, when we can get a few guns for them after the labor leaders get through slowing down production. More important still, we planned to marshal the entire industrial, economic, and agricultural forces of our Nation behind our united effort to supply back of these front-line forces everything that is needed for victory. That is our program for defense. And this armament for defense, so far as I know, has received the unanimous support of all those who believe that the Neutrality Act has kept us out of war and will continue to do so.

This is where I become troubled. It may be I am wrong. Any man who can guess right half of the time in these times of complexity and confusion is a transcendent genius, and I am not one of those. Distinguished, logical-minded gentlemen tell us that this legislation has kept us out of war and if we do not amend it, will continue to keep us out of war. Then why, oh, why, do they insist on spending billions of dollars of our money to create an armament? For what purpose? If we have this legislation, according to their view, we do not need armament. If they are right, then it is folly, a cruel, costly, and stupid hoax, for us to create an army of soldiers merely to sit around and die of ennui in these camps; to create a great air force merely for joy rides through our peaceful skies; and to create a great fleet to be tied up and rot at our wharves and our dockyards. The thing is absurd. If this Neutrality Act has kept us out of war and will, if left intact, continue to keep us out of war, then every one of us ought to get down on our knees and thank God we have been wise enough to create and place upon our statute books such an amazing, tremendous force. We ought to turn our backs resolutely and at once on the squandering of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for armament which it is admitted we do not need. I am puzzled as I confront that situation.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Would the gentleman just let me continue?

Mr. KEEFE. Right at that point.

Mr. EATON. Would the gentleman allow me to toddle along in my own way for a little longer?

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted to ask a simple question right at that point.

Mr. EATON. I doubt if any of the gentleman's questions are simple, but he may ask the question. I will not guarantee to answer it.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman distinguish between a war fought on foreign soil and a defensive war that we might be called on to fight in order to defend this Nation?

Mr. EATON. I will be pleased to answer that. I do make the distinction and

I am absolutely unable to find any reason for believing that it is better for us to permit the monster to come across the oceans and slaughter our people on our own soil, blast down our own cities, and turn our own Nation into a charnel house. Why not keep the thing over there? As long as we can keep it there, that is our wisest policy; and the only way to keep it there is to stand behind the people who by their blood and tears and sacrifice are keeping it there now, and do our best to support them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman suggested standing behind these people. How will the gentleman suggest we keep them in front of us?

Mr. EATON. What does the gentleman mean by "in front of us"? I do not just get the geography that the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman spoke of our standing behind these people who are holding the front lines. How can the gentleman be sure they will stay in front of us and not shift their position, and put us in front of them? The gist of the arguments here today has been that the British are not doing the job.

Mr. EATON. I know. According to that view, Hitler is the great uncrowned saint of the modern world. And Britain is the menace we must meet. I am sick and tired of this kind of talk in the cloakrooms, this eternal revelation of an inferior complex, like country boobs on the sidewalks of New York trying to buy the Brooklyn Bridge from some thug. Why, Mr. Speaker, I will back the brains and character of American men, if they will take off the garments of false humility and assumed stupidity and will stand on their own feet, against any group of men on God's earth in their ability to hold their own and on occasion even to steal part of the other fellow's.

We have always done it and we can do it now. Why do we want to pity ourselves and think of ourselves as an inferior race, to be hornswoggled continually by the British but never by the Germans? Let us stand on our own feet like men and say to the world, "We belong to this world. We are the biggest thing in it. We are going to have a part in it from now until the crack of doom, and we are going to say 'no' to the world when 'no' ought to be said, and we are going to say 'yes' when 'yes' ought to be said, and we are going to have our rights respected and our just purposes carried out."

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Here comes Texas, to whom I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I hesitated to interrupt the gentleman awhile ago. I assume he was referring to my remarks, however. I would like for the gentleman to somewhat modify, if he feels the facts will justify it, his suggestion that I referred to the British people as being slackers, unless he finds that my statement justifies it.

Let me ask the gentleman if we are to assume from his last statement that he is willing that this country accept full responsibility for each European conflict, and believes that America must take sides, one side or the other, in all the wars that are to come up henceforth in Europe.

Mr. EATON. Would the gentleman locate any of them in any other part of the world, while he is asking the question?

Mr. SOUTH. If the gentleman is serious about that, I would suggest there has been a little squabble going on in China.

Mr. EATON. Yes; and in Africa and elsewhere.

Mr. SOUTH. All right.

Mr. EATON. The gist of the gentleman's question is, Do I want us to take part in every little war that takes place anywhere in the world?

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman said America was going to have to stand on its own feet and assert its rights and become a part in world events.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. SOUTH. If that is true, and in the present struggle the gentleman seems to think it is, then I ask if it is likewise to be true in relation to all the intermittent wars that have been fought and likely will continue to be fought every generation or two by the great European powers?

Mr. EATON. All the intermittent wars that have been fought we do not need to worry about; they have already been fought.

Mr. SOUTH. That is true. I mention that, assuming that they will continue as they have in the past.

Mr. EATON. As long as human nature is composed of half brute and the other half angel, men will fight, and I do not expect that until they become all angels they will ever cease to fight. I may be wrong in even admitting such a feeling, but I have long believed that the time is here when the hope of this Nation, and of the world, consists in this Nation's taking its place frankly and completely and assuming all the responsibilities involved in its position as the greatest and most powerful among the family of nations. Believing that, I hope the day will come when this terrible conflict will be over, and the English-speaking nations and the other free peoples of the world will combine and stay combined in some continuous effort to make this kind of a calamity absolutely impossible to our children and grandchildren in the day to come.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Am I to understand that the gentleman is in favor of periodically, say every 20 years, voting away the lives of four or five million boys and all the American dollars to police the world; that periodically we shall send our young men over there to settle some little dispute? The gentleman has said that we are strong, that we can stand on our own feet, that we are brave people, that he is not afraid for America; yet he wants to send these men over there because he

is afraid that others will come over here and lick us.

Mr. EATON. So what?

Mr. WILSON. Is that the understanding I am to have of what the gentleman said?

Mr. EATON. I cannot guarantee any understanding on the gentleman's part.

Mr. WILSON. Did not the gentleman make the statement that it is our job to take one side or the other of these periodic wars that may occur in other parts of the world?

Mr. EATON. If the gentleman will compose himself, I will answer.

Mr. WILSON. All right.

Mr. EATON. I am not going to yield any further, so the gentleman might as well sit down.

We went into the World War under the thrust of our genius for freedom. When the battles were over, we committed, in my judgment, the greatest single betrayal of the American genius in history. We came home and quit and did not follow through to make possible by the reconstruction following the war a world civilization in which this kind of a war would have become impossible. I do not know whether that answers the gentleman's question, but that is my view.

Mr. WILSON. What does the gentleman propose to do at the end of this war?

Mr. EATON. I do not know whether I shall be here then or not at the end of this war.

Since England has been turned inside out and presented here as unworthy of our help, I should like to present for a minute the Germany of Mr. Hitler. Mr. Hitler is the only enemy we need fear on earth, and we have every reason to understand exactly what his principles, motives, and objectives are. He has announced that there are two philosophies, two worlds, now in mortal conflict, and he said in exact words that "one of those worlds must be broken asunder." Are we or are we not in this world? And do we wish to be broken asunder by Mr. Hitler?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. No; please do not keep me chasing rabbit tracks here all day. I want to get somewhere.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman believe Hitler?

Mr. EATON. Did the gentleman ever hear of the father of lies? Well, Hitler is his illegitimate son. I do not believe him.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman contradicts his own statement.

Mr. EATON. If the gentleman will sit down, I will put him out of his suffering.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the American people, 99.9 percent of them, have believed that for once in his life Hitler told the truth when he announced that his objective was world conquest. That is the only time we have ever believed him. Unless we continue in that belief and act upon it, he will finish the job he has begun with such appalling thoroughness and barbarity.

What has he done? He has already, in his attempted conquest of the world,

subdued at the point of the sword practically all the free nations of Europe. He has butchered and is continuing to butcher their leaders. He has slain their women and children, or starved them into hopeless disease. He has enslaved their laborers; he has stolen their wealth; he has closed their churches; he has exiled and degraded their pastors; he has defiled their holy altars; he has closed their schools. He has shut them away from every normal intercourse with the rest of the world.

He has penetrated Africa and Asia and laid the foundation for their future enslavement at the point of his gun.

He has spent a year or two blasting the life out of women and children in England and has crumbled into dust their sacred shrines, their cities and towns.

He has, by the vilest intrigue and by pitiless economic penetration and pressure, reduced the proud people of Italy to a state of abject vassalage.

He at this moment is putting such pressure upon Japan that that great nation is in serious danger of involving itself with us in an absolutely unnecessary and useless war; and he is doing this because he wants to shut us off of the high seas to secure the raw materials that are absolutely necessary for us in time of war and equally in time of peace.

And last, but by no means least, Mr. Hitler is now engaged in an attempt to annihilate the army of Russia, to subjugate and crush its people, and to take over its vast territory so that he can use for his own purposes its inexhaustible natural resources, knowing full well that if he can do this he will then make himself impregnable and become in time master of the world. This is the Hitler situation exactly as it is today.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I agree wholeheartedly in the statements that the gentleman has made about Hitler. The gentleman has painted a very clear picture of Hitler, but practically the same picture is true about Stalin, whom we are supposed to help.

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman, because he now brings me to that point in my speech. I may say that there is no man or woman in this House who is more profoundly antagonistic to the philosophy of communism and nazi-ism than I am, and if you will bear with me for a moment, I would like to paint for you the historic background of these two amazing insanities that have laid hold upon great groups of men all over the world.

For a thousand years the masses of labor in Europe, in every country, were bowed down in unspeakable poverty and suffering beneath the overthrust of a favored few; and out of that passion and suffering and need was born the hateful philosophy of Karl Marx, which is the mother of nazi-ism on one side and communism on the other. At that time, 100 years ago, there was born in the bosoms of these submerged masses a new hope, based upon the application of science to the resources and forces of nature for the service of man, and they became convinced that by the use of science it was possible for industry to produce suffi-

cient of every material commodity to satisfy every normal need of every human being. Out of that conviction were born these two wicked methods of implementing that objective, nazi-ism on one side and communism on the other. They are so morally rotten, both of them, in their embracement of hate as a human motive, in their injustice and cruelty, that I believe they both, so far as their moral sense is concerned, originated in the seething cesspools of hell, into which the corruption of human nature has been draining since the dawn of time. This is what I think of Mr. Stalin's philosophy as well as Mr. Hitler's.

Now, with reference to helping Russia, there was a dear old Scotch lady living in a little cabin by herself, who was very poor, but who believed that God would take care of her. One night she had no bread, so she knelt down and prayed that the dear Lord would send her bread. Some students passing by heard her. They immediately rushed to the grocery store, got a couple of loaves, and dropped them down the chimney. She raised from her knees, brushed the dust off, and said, "Well, the Lord sent it even if the devil brought it." This is my feeling about Mr. Stalin at this moment. I have no quarrel with the Russian people, and at this moment I have not any with their fighting men, but I believe with all my heart that it is better for us to have Mr. Stalin standing up to the Germans now than it would be, later on, even on our own soil or elsewhere, for us to stand up to him alone. That is my answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time that I got through, but I want to say a word on two more points. I am receiving letters from dear Christian men and women from all over the country. They have been taught, and I am sorry they have, that to retain in its present form this Neutrality Act is their only safety in keeping their boys from being slaughtered on the battlefields of Europe.

Well, of course, I have not had any letters from anybody explaining that this year we will kill and maim on the highways of this country about as many people as were killed and maimed in our forces in the World War; but we still believe that highways are a good thing, and, in spite of the fatalities and high taxes, we will hang onto our automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, they are all Christian people. They believe in Christ and in His religion. The essence of the Christian belief is the cross of Christ.

In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time,
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

The cross of Christ is the hope of the world. What we seem to have in this country today is a crossless Christianity that wants to achieve the crown without earning it by wounds and by sacrifices, as did the Christ, whose name it bears. Sooner or later that type of Christianity will fail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. EATON. Make it 2.

Mr. BLOOM. I make it 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, you have great affection and pride in your country, and so have I. My folks have been around here ever since she started. Barehanded, they joined with their colleagues in wresting this continent from savage men and savage beasts. They have helped to lay the foundations of every free institution we possess and enjoy, and I have inherited their past. I love this country. I believe that, next to the Kingdom of God, the United States is the best gift He ever gave to man. And I want to see this greatest of all countries, great in its origin, great in its beliefs, great in its inheritance, great in its magnitude, great in its resources, great in its courage—I want to see my country stand up with the full blaze of circumstance and challenge upon its brow, and take its place from this hour on as the leader among freemen to free the world and keep it free.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in considering how I will vote on the bill to amend the Neutrality Act so that American merchant ships may be armed and dispatched to belligerent ports I am convinced Congress is facing a decision which I had prayed would never be required.

The decision is far more serious than the mere passage of legislation to arm our merchant ships or to dispatch them anywhere the administration may deem desirable to send them.

Standing alone, this legislation might be relatively unimportant. Considered with all other factors in the complex war situation in which we find ourselves, passage of this legislation by Congress will be an admission by Congress that we are engaged in an undeclared war.

As a Democrat I have supported all legislation to aid the democracies short of war. When our pledge of support of all aid short of war was made, I for one meant short of both declared or undeclared war.

Until this bill passes there is a chance, slight though it may now seem, that this country will be able to stop short of an all-out shooting war.

There have already been clashes. Any one of these might be considered cause for war.

Three American warships have been targets of German torpedoes. One has been sunk, with heavy loss of life.

Reports, unconfirmed, are that American warships have sunk as many as 50 German submarines.

This is a shooting war.

So far it is an unofficial war. It has been justified by the contention that our warships were engaged in protecting American defense waters.

I agree that our Nation has the right to defend itself. Attacks by our warships upon war vessels of any belligerent operating in our defense waters are justified under international law.

Now it is proposed to give congressional approval to a proposal to amend our Neutrality Act so that our merchant ships

may be armed and sent far beyond our defense waters into belligerent ports.

Assuredly they will not go to these ports unaccompanied by defending American warships. Assuredly they will not go to these ports unmolested by German submarines and German airplanes. Assuredly the unofficial shooting war which will develop will be on such a scale that the clashes can no longer be passed over as just incidents.

Just as did many other Members of this House, I gave the people of my district a pledge that I would do everything in my power to prevent our country becoming involved in the war.

For me that was not campaign oratory. My votes in Congress will show that I have supported every measure to arm and strengthen our own country.

I have voted against measures which I considered were direct steps toward shooting war. In so doing, I have in some cases opposed administration measures. I want it understood that such action on my part was not an expression of distrust of the President or the administration. It has been the acts of the dictators in Berlin and Rome and Tokyo which have brought us to the verge of war—not the acts of our own Government.

I have believed the administration has proceeded on a policy that the administration believes necessary for the safety of this country. Where I have differed, it has been because I could not agree on certain steps which, in my opinion, placed us nearer that line which once we cross there can be no holding back.

I have believed our mission is to make our own country as strong as possible. I have accepted the position of the administration that this country must be the arsenal of democracy and that world democracy must be saved in order to make our own democracy safe.

Through it all, I have clung to the hope that we may avoid sending another A. E. F. to fight on foreign soil.

Events shaping up in the Pacific, even more than in the Atlantic, have shaken that hope considerably. The possibility of keeping this country out of actual war has become less and less.

If we must defend democracy in the Atlantic, then it is equally our responsibility to defend democracy in the Pacific. Japan is more of an immediate threat than Germany. There may be incidents there that will force our hand within the next few days and make consideration of this legislation to change our neutrality law a matter of very little importance.

I see grave possibilities of war in the Pacific.

Unless that is forced upon us before the vote on changes in the neutrality law, I expect to vote against these changes. In doing so, I wish to state for the record that I oppose these changes because I believe this would be the final step before we cross that line which separates us from actual war.

Once Congress makes these changes, I believe it will be my duty to the people who elected me to say to them:

"I have kept my pledge to do everything within my power to keep us out of war.

"Despite these efforts, we are now actually in war.

"From this day on we must direct our efforts toward winning the war."

Once we have made these changes it will be idle to talk of further steps short of war. We will be at war. Then we will have one job and one job only. That will be to win the war.

Again for the record, let me say, the pledge I made to the people who elected me demands that I record my vote against this legislation to repeal these sections of the neutrality law.

If, despite my vote, merchant ships are armed and dispatched to belligerent ports, then I again state for the record:

"We will be in a war that is not of my making or my choosing; from this day forth, we must exert every effort to win the war which the passage of this legislation will bring about."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the American people and their representatives must stand up and look at things as they really are today and not as they desire them to be. We must put our patriotism above our own comforts. It is because I want to keep war from our land that I am ready to vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act. No true American wants war, but also no true American wants to be enslaved.

The time is at hand when an unquestioning solid front must stand behind the President and follow his leadership toward the accomplishment of the defeat of the Axis Powers. We are facing momentous times, not only because of the gravity of the foreign situation, but also because there are some people in America who are ready to accept the crumbs of liberty a world dictator would throw them and are willing to sacrifice their rights and the rights of their children to live as freemen.

Throughout the whole history of our country, the United States has never surrendered the good American principle of freedom of the seas. In my judgment, we cannot, should not, and will not surrender now. The fall of the small democracies can be described in the words, "Too little and too late"—too little consideration for the dangers that approached them and too late when they were attacked.

What is needed today, as well as guns and tanks, is a united people. I have always supported President Roosevelt's foreign policies, because I believe he is right and the people are with him, and under his leadership Hitler will be destroyed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The vote on this resolution tomorrow brings into consideration an entirely different issue from any other issue which has confronted this Congress since war started in Europe. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] so eloquently and convincingly expressed it, this decision which we are to make tomorrow is to determine whether or not we are to move this country directly into the jaws of war itself, and whether we are to do that thing by subterfuge and in-

direction and by a failure to face the facts clearly and to advise the public honestly.

The vote we take tomorrow involves a decision of that magnitude. For the first time in history this country is seriously considering moving its personnel, its resources and its destiny directly into the jaws of war, without a declaration of war by Congress, and without having a forthright opportunity given the people's Representatives in Congress to vote on a clear-cut decision of war or of peace. While refusing to display courage enough to vote on a declaration of war to settle the issue of war or peace of America we are asked to vote for legislation which is widely and generally referred to as authorizing the President to conduct undeclared war.

NEITHER AN INTERVENTIONIST NOR AN ISOLATIONIST AM I

Mr. Speaker, before going further with my argument, perhaps I should define and review my own attitude so that you can better evaluate my point of view. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—the only member, incidentally, from that great section of this country lying north of Texas and west of Chicago—I have heard all the testimony on the Lend-Lease Act, on the legislation dealing with neutrality repeal, and on other items of foreign policy. Much of this testimony, as you Members know all too well, was in secret session, and its revelations have been denied to you. I speak to you today, as I have voted on past measures affecting our foreign policy, neither as an interventionist who advocates all-out war for America nor as an isolationist who advocates all-in seclusion for America.

I AM AN "INSULATIONIST"

I am, Mr. Speaker, what might be called an "insulationist" who favors co-operating with the rest of the world when such cooperation advances just causes across the seas and safeguards the best interests of America. I believe, too, in "insulating" this country and this hemisphere against war by building and maintaining a defense establishment which will keep our half of the world impregnable. As a Member of the American Congress, I am also what might be called an "Americanist," if I may coin the term, as I believe that no public official has any right to permit his admiration for one foreign power or his abomination for another to blind him to what is best for America. In this selfish world any country which too long and too far neglects its own best interests is preparing for its own downfall and decay.

Because I am not an interventionist, I shall vote tomorrow against the repeal of the Neutrality Act, which, friend and foe alike admit, has helped America steer clear of all-out war in this emergency. Because I am not an isolationist, I have voted for appropriations to the extent of \$13,000,000,000 under the Lend-Lease Act to provide material aid short of war to those fighting against aggression on foreign battlefields. No man can do this and be an isolationist.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT OPPOSITION TO HITLER

I have supported many other moves as well to give aid to Britain and her associ-

ates because I yield to no man in my hatred for Hitler and I detest with all my vigor the one-man tyrannies and techniques set up by Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. In this connection, I even exceed some of my interventionist friends in my dislike and my distrust of totalitarian governments, because I not only deplore them abroad but I oppose the development and adoption of their techniques here at home. I am 100 percent opposed to dictatorial devices wherever on this earth, at home or abroad, they may try to make the people the subjects of the state and to supplant democracy with dictatorship.

So much for my own attitude except to say that I am also opposed to this great Republic of ours becoming needlessly involved in an all-out shooting war, for which we are not prepared and which will again necessitate the sending of millions of our boys across the seas to fight in a second American expeditionary force. I oppose such a course, because I believe it to be at once unwise, unnecessary, and unlikely to do as much to extend lasting freedoms to foreign nations as it is to curtail and corrupt existing freedoms here at home.

With this background in mind, let us consider—you and I—the decision which we confront tomorrow. Let us consider it dispassionately, logically, and without prejudice. Let us think the issues through. Let us consider these monumental issues with the confidence and knowledge that each of you in this House shares with me my dislike for Hitlerism and for Hitler and joins with me, too, in praying that the havoc wrought by him will be mended by his complete and ultimate defeat.

What, then, is the decision we confront tomorrow? First, let me state that I am not one of those who say that tomorrow's decision, far reaching though it is, is finally one of peace or war for America. No man can be sure of that. But all men can be sure, and most men are, that if we repeal the Neutrality Act by our votes tomorrow, it will carry us squarely into the bloody jaws of war itself. Whether we shall be trapped by those jaws to the extent of spilling the blood of millions of our boys on foreign battlefields, to the extent of plunging this country into back-breaking debts many times the one which now so greatly endangers our national solvency and the private-profit system, to the extent of forcing little businessmen, and labor, and farmers—all of us—to give up the security of existing standards and to risk our all upon the outcome of war in two oceans and on four continents, no man can safely say. If we deliberately thrust ourselves into the jaws of death, no man can know that we shall emerge from that flirtation with fate without enduring all the agony and devastation of war itself.

This much we all can know: If we repeal the Neutrality Act and embark upon the program of ordering American ships to shoot their way into belligerent harbors, with bombs raining down upon them and surrounded on every side by underwater and surface weapons of destruction, we ourselves invite death and destruction for American citizens. Al-

ways in the past this has led to war—more shooting, more destruction, and finally the bloody fighting of our armies in the field.

If we start down this path tomorrow by repeal of the Neutrality Act, Congress by voting such repeal must accept the last step in the sordid march when it accepts the first. For the first time in history an American Congress would have voted itself out of control of the decision of peace or war; for the first time an American Congress would have delegated to one man in America—the President—the power to wage undeclared war; for the first time America would have entrusted its destiny to a single individual through the failure of a weak and spineless Congress to function as it should; and for the first time we in this country would watch one man—as the Germans and Italians did—plan the destiny of a great country without the power to help him plan, to tell him halt, or to urge him full speed ahead.

We would have placed in the hands of one man—Mr. Roosevelt alone—by repeal of the Neutrality Act, if, unhappily, it is repealed tomorrow, the power to push us so far into the war there can be no turning back. He could still keep us out of war if he directs it so, if he decides that it is best, but by the same token and for the first time in America he would be granted power to fix a program, if he so decides, which will put us completely in the shooting. His the power and his the responsibility. His the tribute of 10,000,000 mothers if he keeps us out of war, his the taunting knowledge that his mind alone can make the errors which might plunge us in. It was never more truly said of any man or moment that "This is more power than any bad man should have or than any good man should want." And those who vote for it tomorrow have no more right to delegate such power to any individual than any individual has to ask for it.

The decision which we are about to make is to decide whether or not we shall engage in a new kind of undeclared war, entirely foreign to American tradition and American ideals. Every honest man in the House recognizes it as such, and it has been repeatedly mentioned as such by speaker after speaker here today and in the Senate. Unfortunately, the general public has not yet been fully advised as to the real significance of this bill. Mr. Speaker, it is time to be realistic and to face the facts for what they are.

The decision we are about to make, in addition to that, is to decide whether or not we shall forego our established American policy, as enacted by Congress, and substitute for that policy of material aid short of war to those fighting aggression a program leading to the use of men and to the killing of American citizens, and perhaps to outright total war itself.

Make no mistake about it, this is not a vote to decide whether or not we uphold the doctrine of freedom of the seas. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in his remarks stated that it was a vote to decide whether or not we were going to maintain rights which we have always had under the doctrine of

freedom of the seas. Every man and woman in this House knows that neither America nor any other power ever had rights such as are proposed to be pursued if this act is enacted. It would deliberately put inadequately armed American merchant ships, carrying contraband of war, into the battle-torn harbors of belligerent nations themselves. That is not a right of freedom of the seas. It never has been. Nobody has ever contended that a neutral nation during wartime, because of freedom of the seas, had a right to send contraband of war through the blazing guns of warring nations into belligerent harbors. That is the thing we are asked to authorize by our votes tomorrow.

Let us not confuse the issue. Let us be honest with ourselves and vote this proposal up or down on the basis of facts, not on the basis of deception, not on the basis of slogans, not on the basis of calling the type of participation in war suggested here something to which we are entitled on the basis of freedom of the seas, and something which is likely to promote peace for America.

Neither is our decision tomorrow a decision whether or not to aid Great Britain. Congress is committed to that policy. The American Nation today is happily united behind a program of all-out defense of America and all-out aid short of war to Britain and her associates. We all support it. We have gone so far as to make that aid available to China and Russia as well as Britain and her European associates, making it available to Russia even while at the same time we anathematize communism and use all the bad language we decently can in condemning the Russian Government. We are united in that kind of aid to Britain and her associates. But we are asked to authorize in this act something entirely different from material aid to Britain.

Not only that but the proponents of this bill would have you believe it is necessary in order to make available to Great Britain the supplies of goods which are piling up on American docks. In the first place, those goods are not low piling up on American docks. In the second place, we can provide much more aid to Great Britain if we will stop the strikes and confusion and delay in production in this country and produce the defense materials necessary. Then we can do more than we can by this legislation both to serve Britain and protect America.

AN AMERICAN COURSE OF ACTION

In the third place, there is an alternative proposal which is practical and feasible, which will provide just as much aid for Britain and her associates as the repeal of the Neutrality Act, and which is in conformity with American policy. That program is available to the President now through legislation already enacted by this Congress. I refer to the transfer to Great Britain and her associates of such merchant ships and cargo vessels as we have available, to be manned by British sailors, sailing under the British flag and registered with the British Government. Ship for ship, that program will provide fully as much aid to Britain and her associates as the repeal

of the Neutrality Act. It will provide it just as speedily. It will provide it without pushing us one single inch closer to the war. It will provide it now.

Not only will this provide, ship for ship, as much aid for Great Britain, but I believe it can be demonstrated substantially that this alternative proposal of transferring our available merchant ships, and perhaps transferring a few additional destroyers in order to help protect them, will provide, if you please, more aid for Great Britain than the pending proposal to scrap and scuttle our Neutrality Act.

If we repeal the Neutrality Act all we do is to permit private shipowners in America, operating for profit, to send their ships into belligerent harbors, carrying such cargoes as they decide to send to the ports where they can make the greatest profit. They will determine to which harbors they will be sent and what cargo they will carry in order to make the easiest and the surest profit. Under our proposal to transfer the ships outright to Great Britain as an alternative, the British high military command will determine to which harbors those ships go and what cargoes they will carry. In other words, military necessity instead of greed for profit would then become the dominant consideration in the management of these ships. Aid for Britain rather than aid for private profit-seeking shipowners would thus become the first consideration.

If you are actually interested in providing aid to Britain, if you are interested in the transportation of goods to Britain, rather than the transportation of American soldiers to foreign battlefields, I submit you can do that best by calling upon the President, as many of us have, to use the power he has under the Lend-Lease Act to make available to Britain those merchant ships without delay.

I call your attention further to the encouraging and welcome fact that British losses at sea are falling very rapidly and that Britain has the men available to man these ships, because every time a British ship goes down a certain percentage of the men are saved, and the proportion of men to ships in Britain is constantly increasing.

I point out further that last night Lloyds of England announced a 25-percent reduction in premiums on insurance for British merchant marine shipping from the United States. Why was that done? Because the ships are getting through as we want them to do. Our materials are reaching our friends across the seas. Let us step up production of more materials; let us transfer available ships to Britain; but let us keep our boys at home.

I submit in all candor that unless you expect to follow the repeal of the Neutrality Act by a declaration of war, or unless you intend to supplement the transportation of goods by the transportation of American troops, lend-lease our ships to Britain will do the job better in aiding Britain than repealing the Neutrality Act and permitting American private shipowners seeking the profit the President called fool's gold, to determine to which ports the goods should be sent and to what extent.

What have they said in opposition to this alternative proposal? The gentleman from Texas quoted a letter from Admiral Stark, which appears in the hearings in which the admiral said it would be difficult for England to provide the men to man these merchant ships. I presume probably it will be somewhat difficult, but he does not say it will be impossible—he just says it will be difficult. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of difficulties in a war. England is also finding it difficult to provide men to invade the Continent. Should we furnish the men to invade the Continent? The next logical step in such an argument would be for us not only to furnish the ships but to furnish the men to man the ships and then to follow through by furnishing 10,000,000 additional men to use the materials which we send to invade the Continent.

Then, Admiral Land said that the transfer of vessels to the British flag "would result in a degree of control over such vessels by the British which it is inadvisable and unnecessary in our own national interest to incur." But, Mr. Speaker, we are willing to go beyond our own national interest to help Britain in her extreme need; we are willing to recognize that we will lose a certain degree of control of these ships. However, I say to you it is better to lose a certain degree of control of these ships than to lose entirely the control of the destiny of America in wartime, which we tend to do if we repeal the neutrality law and leave ourselves the prey of those who happen to attack our ships as they sail into belligerent harbors where war is raging and where all who enter become subject to the hazards of war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. The arguments advanced by those who oppose this transfer of ships, Mr. Speaker, are weak in comparison with the position that by the transfer of these ships we make available to Britain direct assistance, directed by the British, without beclouding the issue by saying that American private shipowners should be allowed to sail where they will and carry what they can to earn the biggest profits for themselves. I have this on the very best authority—on the authority of the executive vice president of one of the largest American merchant shipping firms, Mr. Robert Lee, of the Moore-McCormick Lines, of New York City. He says, and I quote from a letter which he wrote to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] under date of September 30 last:

From a strictly commercial point of view there is no reason at all why all the goods carried to Great Britain cannot be carried under the British registry, thus removing the dangers of an international incident, as far as the United States is concerned, if one of these vessels should be sunk.

I think the American public, I think the American Congress, is entitled to hear from the proponents of this bill some more substantial objection to transferring the ships and transferring destroy-

ers and delivering the goods safely by this method than the mere statement that it is going to be a little bit "difficult" or a little "inconvenient" to England or to American shipowners before we are asked to pass a bill which may plunge us into a bloody war and risk the lives of millions of American boys to carry out a program which is as unnecessary as it is unwise.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Does not the gentleman believe it would be helpful if somebody speaking for the American Government would come out with a clear-cut statement to the effect that we do not intend to get into this war if we can stay out? That our responsibility is to manufacture the materials for Britain and her allies to carry on the war?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is exactly correct, and I think Churchill gave us the opportunity when he said, "If you will give us the tools we will furnish the men." I think we should say to him today, "Winnie, you are a grand guy, and we are for you. Here are the tools. Furnish the men and use them. We will provide ships and tools and planes and tanks, but we are not going to send another huge expeditionary force to fight 3,000 miles or more away from home." But it seems he is changing his program now, and not only asking us for the tools but the men to use the tools. Both Britain and America are entitled to the clear-cut statement you suggest, so that the war plans can be made on the basis that American manpower cannot be counted upon to furnish the reservoir of troops from which to draw in feeding endless victims into the bloody jaws of Mars.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend the gentleman from South Dakota, who immediately preceded me, not wishing to be the only one on the other side not to do so, referred again to the 25-percent reduction in maritime insurance rates in Great Britain. The only comment I care to make on that is to say that I am happy, indeed, if the assumption—a very natural one—they make that this means fewer British ships are being sunk is correct, and I only hope the time is not far distant when there will be another reduction in that insurance rate.

One of my distinguished friends made a statement to the effect that he would rather fight Hitler year after next than now. With this statement I thoroughly disagree. It is my thought that if we must fight Hitler—and God forbid that we ever be compelled to do so with an army, an A. E. F.—but it is my thought that, if it must happen, I would much prefer to do it with Great Britain, China, and Russia as allies than perhaps by ourselves year after next, when I am afraid they might be vanquished.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Since I have quoted the gentleman, I gladly yield.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman knows, does he not, that our experts say we will

be making approximately 50,000 planes a year 2 years hence; that our tank program, just in its infancy now, will be in full blast; and that we will be turning out more munitions of war than all the countries of the world combined; and that at that time we shall have an Army of 4,000,000 trained men, whereas we could not furnish more than 1,500,000 now?

Mr. JARMAN. If we think alone of planes, tanks, and munitions of war, perhaps I might agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SOUTH. What about the men?

Mr. JARMAN. For my part, if men must be killed, I would much prefer they be Russians, Englishmen, and those of other nations rather than our own.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JARMAN. I think I have answered the gentleman, but I will yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. The gentleman says he would rather see the Russians sacrifice their men than America. I do, too, and that is why I am trying to stay out of this war. There is no logic to that kind of answer and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. JARMAN. We are in disagreement on that, as we are generally on this issue. My distinguished friend, and my other fine friend on the committee who made such a great speech, based their speeches entirely or almost entirely on the assumption, I think it is fair to say, that the passage of this legislation will lead us immediately into war. I disagree with that also. If I agreed with these gentlemen that the passage of this legislation would lead us into war immediately, and if I agreed with their apparent opinion that by failing to pass it we can remain out of war permanently, the Lord knows I would be right with them on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this question has been discussed so generally on this floor and on the floor of the other body, over the radio, in the press, and in various forums, that after all very little remains to be said. It is my purpose to devote the little time allotted to me to one or two points which I think should be covered a little more completely.

Much has been said about the back door. The question has been asked several times why we did not bring this present legislation here a month ago, and the insinuation was made that somebody was trying to put something over. My colleagues know better than that. Everyone in America, not only the intelligent Members of this House but the people of America generally, well know that when the President, who is the Commander in Chief of our defense, sent his first message here requesting legislation on this subject he stated that, while repeal of this section pertaining to the arming of ships was the most urgent necessity, there were other sections of the neutrality legislation to which the Congress should devote its early attention, I believe were the words he used. You well know also that at this same time the Secretary of State in a press conference made practically the same statement. There was no hiding of the issue. The President said at that time:

There are other phases of the Neutrality Act for the correction of which I hope the Congress will give earnest and early attention. One of these provisions is of major importance. I believe that it is essential to the proper defense of our country that we cease giving the definite assistance which we are now giving to the aggressor, for in effect we are inviting their control of the seas by keeping our ships out of the ports of our friends.

Does that sound like an effort to fool anybody or like slipping in through the back door? The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, all testified before our committee, a part of which was public testimony. I think I am correct in saying that in this public testimony—and if I am not they said the same thing in the press—every one of those gentlemen made the statement that it was for the best interests of this country that these other sections, as well as that arming-of-ships section, be repealed, but they all yielded to the immediate urgency and necessity of the occasion relative to the arming of ships, with the idea of bringing this other along later and with no idea whatever of coming in the back door.

The legislation was passed by a good majority. It went to the other body and would have been passed there just as it was here except that certain things happened in the meantime. I need not tell you that we are confronted with a very different situation now than that which confronted us a month ago when the legislation passed this body. I need not call your attention to the attack on the *Kearny* in the meantime in which, I believe, 11 American sailors were killed. I need not call your attention to the sinking of the *Reuben James*, in which, I believe, 101 fine young Americans lost their lives. I need not call your attention to the sinking of a merchant vessel, the name of which I cannot recall now, returning from Spain empty, as the press stated, which was sunk outside of the combat zone near the coast of Africa. All this since that legislation was passed. I need not call your attention to the fact that Russia, whether we admire her form of government or Stalin or not, is fighting the fight we want to see won. I need not call your attention to the fact that, although they are still putting up a magnificent fight, it has been constantly necessary for them to retreat, gradually. I am thankful, since the passage of this legislation here. Possibly the most serious and the last of these great changes is the Japanese situation.

I need not call to the attention of anyone who reads the press the seriousness of that situation today. You tell me that the passage of this bill will lead us into war, and I say to you that the danger of war, particularly with Japan, is, in my opinion, very, very much graver if it fails to pass.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, another reason why I presume the strategy was changed over in the other body was the fact that it is well known, as I have said, that the administration felt this ship-

arming bill should be rushed through. It was hoped that this could be done without extended debate, but that situation did not develop, and it was soon seen it would not develop. I dare say those in charge of the legislation in the other body reached the conclusion that it was unnecessary and useless to keep the country in a constant turmoil about this issue and that we had better put it all together and have it over with at once. Then, of course, the titular head of the Republican Party demanded that this be done and three eminent Senators of that party introduced legislation along that line. Not only that, but over here we have lovable and distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee on this side, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, whom you so thoroughly enjoyed hearing today, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. STEARNS], and others who feel just as we do on this side. So it is not a partisan issue, and I heartily commend all of you on the other side and those who entertain your political belief throughout the Nation who agree with us in this position because if there ever was a time during the existence of this country when no man in public life should play politics with our foreign relations and with our national defense, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that time is now. I do not believe there is any man in this body who is doing that or who will do it when the time comes to cast his vote.

One more thought and I am through.

Your attention has been called to this fact—and I wish to emphasize it—that not only the Commander in Chief but the Secretaries of War and of Navy, as well as the heads of every single defense agency in the Government, believe that the passage of this legislation is urgently necessary not only to the safety but to the peace of this country.

I confess that I am not a professional along that line. I confess my willingness to yield my opinion in matters like that to the distinguished gentlemen of long experience who are charged with the duty of defending this country and who, I believe, know more about the best way to do it than I do.

Something has been said about following the leader. If that be following the leader, I disagree with my distinguished friend again. On the other hand, in the European countries, as you know, that still have even the semblance of democracy, there is the parliamentary system of government, where, when the administration proceeds along a course for a certain time, it is required to submit its policies to the parliament. A vote of no confidence puts that administration out and commences a new system under a new leadership. After we have gone as far as we have with lend-lease, with ship arming, and with the appropriation of money, already \$13,000,000,000, could it be at all possible, if we fail to pass this bill, to convince those people, who are familiar with that other system of government, that we are not turning back?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, upon the shoulders of each and every Member of this House must fall the burden tomorrow of casting his vote as his convictions dictate and as he feels the welfare of his constituents back home demands. I am no exception to that rule. The President called upon the Congress a year and a half ago to protect and defend the Government of the United States and to support measures which would bring about that end. I have consistently rallied to the defense of our country by voting for measure after measure that has come before the House seeking to bring about that end, relating to both appropriation of moneys and the acquisition of materials both for Britain and the United States.

I stand here today before this Congress and before the people of my district and say that I have done everything within my power to see to it that a proper defense of this greatest of all nations has been brought about. It is my humble opinion that every Member of this House has done likewise, and that the people back home stand united on one thing, at least, the proper defense of the United States.

There is, however, in my opinion, a fine line to be drawn between the proper defense of this country and the step which we are called upon to take and which will be decided on by tomorrow's vote. Standing here before the House, I say that I cannot cast my vote tomorrow in favor of what constitutes a virtual declaration of war. Whether or not we like to admit it, it is that issue and that alone upon which we are deciding.

Although I have stood steadfastly for all measures dedicated to the defense of this country, I cannot bring myself to go any further than the campaign promise I made a year ago on my reelection to Congress. Upon that promise I told the people of my district I would either stand or fall. That pledge was to do everything within my power to keep our American boys from being sent in an expeditionary force to some foreign clime.

It is my belief today, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronted with an issue pure and simple between the necessity of sending an American expeditionary force abroad and of keeping out of real, bloody conflict. The responsibility is great, for the issues involved are numerous. Therefore, I say that the decision has come to me, as I am sure it has to many other Members of the House, to take a stand against an American expeditionary force. I therefore pledge that I will vote against the repeal of these sections of the neutrality law.

Let me make this perfectly clear: If the time shall come, and I long ago gave up hoping it would not, that my beloved country is dragged into this disastrous struggle of Europe, no more determined heart will be found than mine in realizing its successful completion. Until war is declared by the Congress and in accordance with the Constitution, at the demand of the people of the United

States, I will continue to oppose attempts to send our American youth to slaughter in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM].

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, we have come to a crucial point in the history of our country. The action of the House on this pending legislation before us today may well affect the destiny of our Nation. No vote which we will be called upon to cast, in my judgment, will carry more responsibility and greater potentialities than that with which we are face to face at the present moment.

Would that we had the power to look into the future and foretell, with certainty, the ultimate results of our action here today as reflected in the future life of our Republic.

I, as one Member of the House of Representatives, deplore the manner in which this measure is attempted to be summarily foisted upon the American people.

I feel the dignity and majesty of the House of Representatives have been assailed and that this great tribunal of democracy—this legislative branch of the Government, closest to the people and more expressive of the thoughts and sentiments of our citizens—has by legislative rules and precedents been denied a fair and just hearing to determine by competent evidence the ultimate effect upon the well-being of our Nation that such a change of national policy would entail, as outlined in the amendments embodied in the pending joint resolution.

I speak advisedly and as one who has enthusiastically supported every appropriation bill and every other legislative enactment for national defense.

I cannot, however, accept as a Member of Congress this pending measure, which has had no hearing by a legislative committee of our body, no opportunity offered for testimony, either pro or con, on the effect the proposed amendments as contained in the resolution here presented—namely, the repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act—will have on the peaceful security and future welfare of our country.

I have before me the report submitted to the membership of the House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I respectfully direct the attention of the House to paragraph 3 of that report, wherein the following language appears:

The repeal of section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 is recommended by the President in his message to Congress of October 9, 1941.

The message of the President follows, and in that message there is nothing contained, either by implication or suggestion, advocating the drastic steps and measures which are embodied in this proposed resolution and are now presented to us for our consideration and approval.

To my mind only one logical conclusion can be drawn and that is, that the President of the United States had no intention of going further at this time than repealing section 6 and permitting the arming of merchant vessels in neutral waters as outlined in his message. I have

heard no expression from him, either oral or written, of his desire to go beyond that point.

That was the issue, and the only issue, we voted for and passed in the House of Representatives on October 17, 1941, when it was under consideration in this Chamber.

We are now confronted with an entirely new proposition, clearly outside the pale of the President's message as embodied in the committee report, which proposes the erasing of all barriers of restrictions, and calling upon American ships and the American Navy to convoy war materials to the ports of warring nations.

The outcome of such an operation to my mind, Members of the House, can have but one effect, and that is, to inevitably plunge America into war.

It is perfectly obvious and apparent, even to the most incredulous, that when our ships enter the combat zone carrying contraband materials of war, and under convoy, necessarily some sinkings are going to occur with the resultant loss of American life. As a direct consequence of those happenings war hysteria will run rampant and feverish emotionalism will again grip the hearts and breasts of our American citizens, and once more will our Nation be drawn into the horrors and throes of war with all the suffering, misery, and sacrifice therein entailed.

Today, in a more calm and dispassionate atmosphere, let us reflect on our experiences of 1917 and 1918, and let us consider in the light of conscience and intellect the consequences and ultimate results of such action before we decree, by our vote here today, inevitable death and destruction to countless numbers of our American youth in both branches of the military service of the United States.

When we passed the Lease-Lend Act, it was the expressed thought and intent of the Congress that nothing herein contained shall affect conditions concerning convoys and that our ships should be kept out of the combat area.

Why the change now? If, by adhering to that policy, we have maintained our country at peace, why now jeopardize our position by inviting attack by such a drastic departure as herein contemplated?

America will be a greater influence for the peace of the world by maintaining her position as now existing, rather than becoming an active participant in another European war—one which can only end in untold suffering and disaster for countless numbers of our citizens.

America is willing to be the arsenal for the democratic nations of the world. We have generously appropriated vast sums of money for their defense and sustenance.

We have furnished them implements of war in unlimited quantity, consisting of guns, tanks, planes, motorized units, ships, supplies of all kinds and character, and we will continue so to do until the scourge of Hitlerism and all he stands for is wiped from the earth.

To enable us to meet these great demands, we have imposed heavy sacrifices upon our own citizens. We have placed upon the shoulders of the American people a heavy burden of taxation well nigh overwhelming, which they have accepted

and are bearing most nobly and patriotically to enable us to build up our own defenses on land, sea, and air, and make America secure and impregnable from any attack and, at the same time, enable us to continue to furnish the essentials of war for the allied nations.

This far and no farther, Mr. Speaker, are the people of the United States, in my judgment, willing to go, and unless America is attacked and the security of our Nation imperiled, I will not vote to send an American soldier or sailor to die on the soil or waters of Europe, Asia, or Africa, except in defense of our country and to preserve those ideals of liberty, freedom, and democracy which have been our birthright from the foundation of the Republic.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the splendid and courageous speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH] who called attention to the fact that it is time we take stock, that we count the costs before we embark upon another world war. Mr. Speaker, I shall take as my text that wise injunction in the remarks I am about to make.

Mr. Speaker, America today stands at the crossroads. The action of this House upon the measure to scrap the Neutrality Act will determine whether we again are to plunge headlong into the maelstrom of world-power politics and wars. It will determine whether it is possible for the American people and the American Government to profit by bitter experience. In order that we may not entirely forget our experience of 1918 and 1919 in the first World War, I shall now detail some of the results of that misadventure.

Before we vote on this measure, Mr. Speaker, we should realize something of what we are embarking upon if this House approves the amendments to this bill sent to us from the Senate.

As the gentleman from Texas said, it is time to take stock of the costs of life, of limb, of suffering, of broken minds and hearts, of the billions upon billions of money, all of which must be earned "by the sweat of the man who labors," before we decide to embark upon another and much worse misadventure into world-power politics and wars.

There is one way, and one way only, in which we can acquire any idea whatever of what lies ahead if we pass this bill, and that is to examine the results of our former experience.

Mr. Speaker, in the first World War there were 39,362 American boys killed in action on foreign battlefields.

There were 14,009 who died of wounds received in action.

There were 192,361 others wounded in action.

There were 76,757 who died of disease, accident, and other causes during their service in the war.

More than 100,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities have died since the war, many of them victims of their service. There are today more than 350,015 World War veterans receiving

compensation for service-connected disabilities. There are approximately 188,213 widows, orphans, and other dependents receiving compensation for the death or disabilities of World War veterans.

Our expenditures and loans to our Allies during the period of the war reached more than \$40,000,000,000.

The Veterans' Administration recently estimated that the total cost at this time of all World War benefits, together with related expenses, was \$13,970,891,303.

The human misery, the agony of human hearts, the grief that was poured into that war, and has been caused since, is utterly beyond human computation or human comprehension; yet, we tomorrow, notwithstanding all this, will be faced with a vote upon another such misadventure, the results of which can scarcely be accurately computed regardless of our experience of yesterday. May God grant that when this vital vote is taken we may exercise some of the sanity with which we are presumed to be endowed.

How many of us here realize what the program is upon which we shall embark if the House gives its approval to the Senate amendments? How many of us realize that once embarked upon that program we will have taken upon our shoulders the responsibility of perpetuating the British Empire and such other nations, including Soviet Russia, as either this or other Presidents shall undertake to perpetuate?

How many of you who are listening to me have forgotten an event of some years ago which in my opinion accurately measures the degree of gratitude, or lack of it, of our Allies in that other World War when, led by Great Britain, they all, with the exception of little Finland, repudiated their honest debts to us? Mr. Speaker, when one ponders this fact and then remembers our present attitude toward splendid, honest little Finland, it must bring the blush of shame to the cheek of everyone who still has respect for honesty and fair dealing.

Mr. Speaker, late in April 1917, upon a business trip to France just after our declaration of war, I was told by officials of the French Government that when we declared war against Germany their nation was bled white, that they were whipped, and that the only thing which gave them the courage to hang on until we got there was the knowledge that our troops were on the way.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it was conceded that our entrance was the deciding factor in that war, that it was the one thing which gave assurance of victory for the Allies. Subsequent events, together with the valor of our troops, confirmed the opinion expressed to me. We then were the saviors, Mr. Speaker, but it was not long before in their minds, in their hearts, and in their words we became the Shylocks of the world.

Mr. Speaker, my ideas of the responsibilities of citizenship encompass many things, among them being the obligation to serve in whatever capacity a man can best serve his country in great national emergencies. I responded to President McKinley's call to the colors in the Span-

ish War. I served as an enlisted man in the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry with the expeditionary forces to Cuba. When we declared war against Germany in 1917, I was married and had two small children. I was beyond draft age, and yet, because of my belief, I again volunteered for service in the Infantry. I served more than 2 years in the first World War, 11 months of that service being with the American Expeditionary Forces in France, as an infantry officer. I know something of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we in this House faced cold hard facts. Our experience, more especially our experience in fighting other nations' wars, should teach us that war is wholly destructive; that it is utterly horrible; that it is without a redeeming feature; that it settles nothing. Notwithstanding the mouthings of certain individuals in high places and others seeking high places, it is the opinion of experts that our participation in this war will not result in any victors, but will result in the defeat of all participating and the probable destruction of civilization as we now know it.

It is already known that the present European war is indescribably more devastating and horrible than the last one. That fact is agreed to by every military authority in the world. Men, women, and children are being ruthlessly bombed, maimed, and killed.

We must not forget that in the event expeditionary forces are sent to the four corners of the world, as they will be if the Senate amendments are adopted, the flower of American manhood and womanhood will go to the bloody filth and vermin of the trenches to face new and more horrible kinds of destruction. That is what we talk about when we speak of war.

Millions of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, wives, husbands, and children will be plunged into the most awful agony known to the human soul, the agony of sending loved ones away to a fate perhaps worse than death, and all this to again vainly attempt to make the world safe for democracy. That is what we mean when we talk of entering this war. It is a part of the costs we ought not forget at this time.

Millions of our young citizens will be required to offer up their bodies as cannon fodder, to be blasted to bits and churned up with the bloody muck of the battlefields, trampled over by battling hosts, and ground into the bloody muck by lumbering tanks. That is what we are talking about when we speak of entering this war. This is a part of the cost.

Millions will come back from overseas maimed and mangled in mind and body, a burden to themselves and to society. Until they do return there will be the years of agony of waiting, and waiting, with those left at home not knowing whether they are destined ever to see their loved ones again. That agony in myriad cases will be intensified by the return of loved ones so mangled physically and spiritually that death would be more merciful. That is what we are talking about when we speak of war.

Uncounted millions, whether at the front or at home, will receive mental

wounds from which they never could hope to escape in this life. That is what war means; that is what entering this war means. When voting on this measure tomorrow, let us not forget these costs.

Following our experience in this war, our people and the people of other nations of the world will suffer a depression far worse and far longer than the bitter want and privation in which we are still to some extent struggling. Economic charts of the past 146 years show that every war has been followed by a depression; each succeeding depression has been deeper and longer than the preceding one.

The depression following the World War has been the deepest, the longest, and the most devastating in the history of the world. Just as the present war will be incomparably worse than the last, so the depression which will follow this war will be incomparably worse than the last one. It will utterly paralyze our cultural, social, political, and economic system with evil results no man can foresee.

If we go into an all-out war, regardless of the outcome, life as we have known it in America will be forever lost to the crippled living as well as to those who fall in battle. Unless we are forced to repel an invasion no war would be worth such a price.

There are those who fear an invasion of this country or this hemisphere by the legions of Hitler. I would remind them that it was not so long ago that General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, made the statement that with 450,000 trained and properly equipped men he could prevent an invasion of this country by any other nation or combination of nations. There is not a single military authority who believes or who will say that Hitler and all his legions could ever invade us. There is no nation in the world today which is better able, which can be more nearly self-contained economically than this country. For this reason to destroy us economically, regardless of the outcome of the European war, is not among the possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to make a choice to go into this war on one side or the other. We need not make such a decision if the Members of this House will exercise the intelligence, the courage, and, yes, the patriotism with which I know they are possessed. If they will do this, their vote will broadcast to the world the fact that the Members of this body are truly the representatives of the people who send them here, and as such—speaking the will of 80 percent of our people—they will not countenance sending our boys, the flower of young manhood in this country, to the battlefields of Europe, Asia, or Africa to fight the battles of other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the adoption of a policy of military protection and perpetuation of the British Empire, or any other empire or nation.

I am opposed to being a party to the policing of the world after peace has been declared.

I am opposed to any attempt of this Government to ram "the four freedoms" down the throats of the people of any other nation in the world.

I still believe in permitting the people of each nation to determine for themselves, so far as they can, what their daily lives shall be.

I still believe that the people of all other nations shall be free in spirit, to mold their own lives as best they can without interference from us.

I still believe in the precepts laid down by the founding fathers of this country. I still believe that by properly arming ourselves and properly training a sufficient number of our youth and having them always ready, we can, if necessary, defy the whole world, including the nations of South and Central America.

Of course, we could not do this in our present unprepared condition. But, Mr. Speaker, we are unprepared only because of the fact the President failed utterly to inform Congress of the complete needs of the national defense prior to June 1940—less than a year and a half ago.

The difficulties now existing in the manufacture of weapons and material of war are due largely to the export, during the past few years many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of materials vital to our national defense and to our success in reaching and maintaining peak production. These exports have been used in the manufacture of munitions and equipment of war, much of which will be turned against our own troops if we take the step we appear about to take.

Our failure long ago to acquire sufficient reserve stocks of minerals and other materials vital to us at this time is responsible in part for the tragic situation which faces the more than 100,000 fine, small, but highly important industries which, because of their inability to secure the supplies with which to continue operations, are faced with the closing of their plants.

The unemployment caused thereby will run into the millions. Tragedy hardly expresses the situation, which will face their employees when finally they are without work or means with which to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, the American people of today, unlike we of that other generation, have had the intelligence to resist the insidious propaganda which seeks to draw us into the tragic error of once again trying to make the world safe for democracy.

Above all, as we see ourselves drawn ever nearer to an all-out war where American expeditionary forces of from eight to ten million young men will be sent to foreign battlefields and our one-ocean navy possibly faced with a desperate struggle in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, let us keep clearly before us the awful reality of mangled bodies and wounded minds, of indescribable depths of human agony and human misery which lie hidden behind the glib slogans of the propagandists who would get us into this war, but who would not fight it for us and who would not pay for it.

Let us do our duty by the American people; let us represent them. Let us not forget our obligations to the generations to come. Let us not destroy all possibility of the continued existence of an America that to all the other peoples of the world has ever been a land of

hope, and to our own people promised land itself.

Let us defeat this measure; let us not again be fooled by the warmongers of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to address the membership of the House. I have been undertaking to speak in public for 39 years. I have never risen, as I recall the matter now, that I did not suffer a degree of stage fright, due to a realization of my own inabilities. This is not a time, nor is it an occasion, when I should undertake to practice in this presence, or on any other people in speaking.

I regard this as the most crucial hour we shall ever see, if we are fortunate enough to keep out of this war, which we are trying our best to do. I do not like to use the word "unfair." It is a terrible word applied to any individual, and I mean it in its lightest and most polite sense when I suggest to you that it is unfair to say of those who advocate the passage of legislation that would repeal sections 2 and 3 of this act, that they are willing to plunge this country into war. It would be just as fair for me to retort that you, who will not go along with me, are trying to appease that man Hitler. Neither of these things is true. I often become impatient with the line of thought pursued by my fellows, but I do not become impatient with my realization that they are honest, no doubt, in what they do. I am going to refer to Hitler, in the course of the few remarks that I shall have to say. I do not do it with the idea that it is a pleasure to me to cuss him out, but because I am trying to bring to your realization and mine the fact that we are dealing with this institution in the world even in our own country.

You have heard it said in substance that we pursued a course of war 21 or 22 years ago, and we are admonished to avoid a repetition of that situation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the membership of this House that the mistake was not made by the United States in entering that war but in not following up the advantage which was gained after the war was ended. Can you contemplate what would have been the situation in this world if the United States had not stopped the Axis Powers in 1918? Would it have been 2 or 3 or 5 years before democracies would have been virtually wiped from the face of the earth?

Amongst those of my constituents who have communicated to me in commendation of the course which I have pursued since the day I followed my brother in this Congress, those who have been most positive in their commendation of that course have been members of the American Legion and the men who saw service in France.

I have replied to their letters and said, "God bless you forever." It so happened that I was the chairman of the exemption board, as we called it, in that war, and I put my own boy down in class A. In God's good name, I would 10,000 times rather have gone myself, but I did not hesitate to send him if the country

needed him. This is an exceedingly serious time. That which distinguishes the difference between us is not patriotism or nonpatriotism, but what is the best thing to do to keep this country out of total war. We see that we have a man in the world and an institution that cannot be negotiated with. There is nothing that can stop him except the power of righteousness in the world of which we are a great part, thank God. I have not eaten, I have not slept as I should since I have been in this House because of the awful situation, as I realize it, that our people are in; but it is not because of myself, because I am getting to that point where I can hardly be robbed of many years, though I confess to you I would like to live a long time, because now at the age of 60 I think I am just learning how to live; but those in whom I am interested are the boys and girls, the men and women, the young people who will come after you and me. I want to preserve this country inviolate in all of its institutions and appointments which I consider good to the generations who will follow you and me in this life in the United States.

Observations in the nature of accusation, perhaps have been made, and I refer to those in all kindness, to the effect that perhaps England is not doing her part. Go with me to London, go with me to Liverpool, go with me to the fair countries of England and others that have been bombed, whose women and children have been driven from their homes and killed by the thousands and tens of thousands, and I say to you it is not in my mouth to criticize England.

I apprehend today that England has had no more than a breathing spell while that man Hitler trained his guns upon his own ally by agreement, and commenced fighting Russia; and that England is doing the best she can to prepare herself against the day when that man Hitler will turn his armies back to the west and to England and to the United States, as he purposes to do.

There is nothing we can do to add to the determination of Hitler to subjugate the world.

I am a Roosevelt man, 100 percent. He has been called a warmonger. It has been said of him that he desired, and gladly was undertaking, to plunge this country into war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. I have heard, and I believe it from what I have heard him say here, that one of the members of a party of which I am not a member said that accusation was untrue and unfair and he could not be controlled by it.

It is pretty near, so that we would just as well repeal what we have done if we publish to Hitler today, that man who cannot be believed in any instance, that we have taken a backward step in our attitude toward his nefarious purposes in this world. I know what Hitler is by what he says he is not. I know what he is not by what he says he is. If he says he has no designs upon the Western Hemisphere or the United States, I know he has. I do not conclude that it is a

declaration of war or that it is a cowardly way of making a declaration of war when we say we will delegate to the President, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the Secretary of War, and to the Secretary of State simply the power to let our ships move in commerce wherever they think they should move. It is not a mandamus. It is not a mandatory injunction. It is but the lifting of a restraining order or the dissolving of an injunction already put, and we simply say that we have some confidence that they will do the best they can.

If ever I have been tolerant of others' views, it has been, I think, on the subjects involved in the House repeal of section 6 of the Neutrality Act, and the repeal of sections 2 and 3 of this act, a step taken by the Senate in addition to its concurrence with the action of the House in repealing section 6.

The whole matter relates itself to the question: In this, our dilemma, what shall we do? We are in a situation engaging the most serious thought and prayerful consideration of every thoughtful American who loves his country, its flag, and its people. Not thought and prayerful consideration today, dismissing the matter tomorrow, but every hour of every day we live. When I am awake I see Hitler every hour. I have seen him in my dreams. I do not have to read Mein Kampf to know Hitler—a reliable and true understanding of him is to be there found—but I have seen him on every day's page of time since September 1939. So have you.

In Mein Kampf he, strangely, I may say, made known what he is and what his program is for and in the world. On that I may rely, for his every action leads to that end. World dominion and world domination are the things he has set himself to; and they are the things he is striving to attain, regardless. As one of the methods of carrying out his plans he early turned to deceit and falsehood—so much so that I am able to know what he is by what he says he is not, and to know what he is not by what he says he is. Looking at his record since 1939: If he says he has no designs on Norway, I know he does have designs—terrible designs—on Norway. If he says he has no program for the Western Hemisphere, I know he does have a program for the Western Hemisphere—a terrible program. And, too, why should we think he, after subjugating the rest of the world, will leave us alone? Such a thought is more than childish.

I can very well understand why he has followers in the persons of Goering, Bernstorff, Hess, and others, constituting the Nazi military hierarchy, but I am beginning to wonder how long the fathers and mothers of Germany are going to allow their sons to die on battlefields to satisfy the unholy ambition of this Hitler with his military gang.

It is certain that Hitler will not stop. Hitler will have to be stopped. Ah, there is the question: How shall he be stopped? When shall he be stopped? Where shall he be stopped? He must be stopped by being overpowered. He cannot be negotiated with. I want him stopped as near to now as possible. I want him

stopped as near to where he is at present as possible.

It is recognized and, I think, well understood, that Italy and Japan are stooges of Hitler and Nazi power. It is quite certain, also, that with or without occasion, when he shall have accomplished his purposes in respect to other nations, he would not hesitate to turn against those who had thought they were his friends and he theirs. I shall vote for the Senate amendments, to the end that the greatest measure of security may be provided and guaranteed to the greatest number of our people and to our country.

The proposed amendments are not in the nature of a mandamus or a mandatory injunction, but they are rather the lifting of a restraining order or the dissolving of an injunction. I am willing, with all confidence, to lift such a restraining order, thereby placing within the power of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy the privilege and the responsibility to say where our ships may travel upon the seas. I do not believe that anyone would allow himself to be controlled in his vote by any dislike of the President or the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy. I have confidence in them all. Whether either of them is not to the liking of one is not, I submit, a reason for refusal to leave to them this responsibility. I remind that Mr. Roosevelt is President of the United States, my country and your country; that Mr. Hull is Secretary of State of the United States, my country and your country; that Mr. Stimson is Secretary of War and Mr. Knox Secretary of the Navy of the United States, my country and your country.

It may be that many will say we are exposing some of our men and some of our boys to danger and possible death if our ships are allowed to go into what is termed "combat zones." I am sorry that it may be true that some may be called upon to make the great sacrifice; but I am unwilling that any of these who might be thus exposed to danger should come to us when our Western Hemisphere is attacked, bombs are falling, airplanes flying, tanks moving, not only threatening but destroying our homes, our men, women, and children, have those who might have contributed to the prevention of such disaster say that I could have helped to prevent this if you had allowed steps to be taken which would have stopped Hitler before he got here. These are not idle dreams. They are things we must face.

To Hitler there is no neutral zone on the seas. He will infest our shores with mines and submarines as quickly as he would any other part of the ocean. Our situation is one that we have not sought. These dangers have been thrust upon us; and we must answer the questions, How shall Hitler be stopped? When shall he be stopped? And where shall he be stopped?

And, too, I respectfully suggest that our vote on the Senate amendments to the Neutrality Act, if a concurring one, will tell Hitler we realize that we cannot stop and will not stop until he is stopped.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

THERE CAN BE NO NEUTRALS NOW

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has acted wisely in allotting eight hours for debate, as we consider the additional Senate amendments to the Neutrality Act, which we recently amended in one particular. When the proposed amendment of the Neutrality Act was before the House, I supported its provision permitting the arming of our merchant ships and made a speech in which I stated that I favored the repeal of the entire act. I now rise to support the additional Senate amendments, which I consider a further step in the right direction as they reassert our long-time national stand for freedom of the seas.

NO AMERICAN WANTS WAR

War means destruction, killing, burning, sweat, blood, and tears. In the words of a great American general, "war is hell." I think it unfair and not appropriate at this time for any believer in isolation to keep repeating the statement that those who want to defend American ideals are warmongers. Nobody wants to send an A. E. F. to Europe. No sane American wants to have our young men sent into the submarine-infested oceans. We must all deeply regret that the economy of this Nation, which was moving along lines of permanent recovery in agriculture and in industry, should suddenly have been diverted to war industries. It is probably true that more men are employed today than ever before in the United States and that there is a smaller list of unemployed than at any other time, but what a price we are paying for it!

We often hear the statement that Hitler has abolished unemployment. Yes; he abolished it; but how? By turning all the industry and the economy of Germany into constructing a war machine, and in order to meet that threat we are obliged to do the same thing. So let us have an end, during this discussion, of the word "warmongers."

DOES WAR SETTLE ISSUES?

A colleague of ours a few days ago delivered a speech in this House in which he emphasized strongly the oft-repeated remark that nothing is ever accomplished by war, that it never settles anything. I do not know who first made that statement, but it is just as wrong historically as many other statements now floating through the air. For 70 years this country debated whether it was a nation. Many of the best men believed that a State had a right to withdraw from the Union. The War between the States settled that issue and decided once and for all that we are a nation, "one and indivisible."

One hundred and seventy years ago our fathers on the Atlantic border decided they wanted to be free from England and must have their own government. They declared their ideals in a famous document which we venerate as the Declaration of Independence. It took eight years of hard fighting and suffering, many lives, and destruction of much property to establish the principles there enunciated.

Quickly, the Bill of Rights strengthened and supplemented those pronouncements which to us today look as if they ought to have been acknowledged everywhere and at all times by English-speaking people. The American Revolution settled the fact that a real nation of free people would dwell on the American Continent, independent of European control. I could go down through the pages of history pointing out many issues settled on battlefields. It is true that civilized men hope for other methods of settling international difficulties.

ARE WE BEING DRAGGED INTO A DARK AGE?

Students of history know that 23 centuries ago there existed in the peninsula of Greece a marvelously highly developed civilization. A precious heritage of wisdom and guidance was given to the world by the philosophers and thinkers of the Golden Age of Greece. In sculpture and in architecture we look upon their masterpieces as models. Then that classical civilization was engrafted onto the more vigorous type which flourished about 2,000 years ago on the Tiber, known to the world as Rome. For centuries, from her seven hills, she ruled the world, and built a society in many respects unparalleled especially for governmental institutions. Rome ruled at that time practically all the known world, from England in the west to the furthestmost shores of the Mediterranean, all around that inland sea and north into the dark forests of Germany. That civilization collapsed and the Dark Ages set in. Education and learning were driven into hiding. The marble palaces were torn to pieces. Force was the one and only thing that counted; right and justice were not considered. For a thousand years that dreadful period of darkness engulfed the world. Are we approaching another such period now? Libraries have been written on the cause of the fall of Rome, and it will probably be debated as long as day returns. Perhaps the seeds of destruction were carried within that civilization. Are the same dark forces of evil now appearing on the horizon? Is it possible that this civilization which has accomplished so much for humanity and human kind will be plunged over the abyss into another dark age? I certainly fear the black cloud which hangs over Europe today and is darkening the entire world.

AMERICA NOW THE CENTER OF A COSMIC STORM

The same year that Roosevelt was inaugurated President—1933—Adolf Hitler and his war party came to power in Germany. All must admit that whatever may be the shortcomings of this administration, the whole effort has been to better the lot of the average man. Our thought has ever been toward improvement of the condition of that one-third of our people which is ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed. In the spring of 1933 our farmers were bankrupt, discouraged, and disheartened. In the early days of the administration, a united effort between executive and legislative branches of the Government devised methods to improve the financial condition of the farming world. The stimulus of farm prosperity was felt by indus-

try, commerce, and finance, and a vastly improved economic condition prevailed from one end of our country to the other.

In Germany, during that same period of time, the borders of the country were barriers to honest information. Germany commenced at once a plan for rearmament, ignoring and setting aside the terms of the Versailles Treaty. Ours was an administration that sought to benefit the downtrodden and helpless, moving along lines of justice and equity. In the interior of Germany was set a pace for world conquest. Guns, ammunition, and roads were made with no purpose other than conquest by battle. Debts were contracted without intention of paying. "Bullets, not butter," was an oft-repeated slogan. They wrecked their currency so as to repudiate their debts. They committed crimes against the populace, the most cruel known to mankind. When the actual war broke over Europe, we all hoped it would not envelop America. We wanted to be neutral. Today we are the center of a cosmic war storm, for we are the arsenal of the democracies.

CONQUESTS BY THE GERMAN WAR MACHINE

Thirteen separate nations which existed in Europe a few months ago have been conquered and absorbed. Boundary lines are abolished and conquered countries are the slave territory of the Reich. It was only 3 years ago that all said the finest army, the most perfectly trained army in all the world, was the French Army. Today most of those fine troops, nearly 5,000,000 trained men, are either dead or slaves. They did not get a chance to fight. The finest equipped small nation in the world was industrious and intelligent Czechoslovakia, today scattered to the four winds of heaven, with many of her ablest leaders in concentration camps or in their graves. The Balkans, that part of Europe which for hundreds of years has been the birthplace of many wars, are today conquered, with thousands lost facing the German firing squads.

Hitler's legions march and his famous airplanes ride supreme across the Alps, along the shores of the Mediterranean, north to the icy waters of the Arctic. And just think, today he thunders at the gates of Moscow and Leningrad, most of the Ukraine is his, and he is already reaching for the oil and iron of the Caucasus.

Since time began no such series of conquests has ever been attained as have crowned the achievements of the German war machine. Every conquered country has added to its strength. The cruel methods adopted, making slaves of the conquered people and turning the economy of the conquered land into an adjunct of their machine, have terrified and completely crushed great nations. Are we in danger? I hope not, but I am certainly alarmed at the prospect of German encirclement.

NAZI IDEALS ANTAGONISTIC TO CHRISTIAN RELIGION

I fail to comprehend the apparent apathy of the great Christian groups of the world today and their indifference to the threat of the German war machine. Every thinking person realizes that the Christian religion has given a different

concept to modern life from that held by the ancients. Christianity teaches righteousness, justice, honesty, respect for contract, right doing, humanity, and brotherly love.

What of the German ideal? The Nazis go back to the old heathen mythology which was believed in the woods of Germany 20 centuries ago. They worship the god of war, recognizing no right of the individual and declaring everything subservient to the state. It seems to me that the Christian religion in every form is at stake in this struggle, and I am sorry that all followers and believers in Christianity cannot see the necessity for defense of the Christian ideal.

BITTERNESS TOWARD ENGLAND

It is to be regretted that there are still many living among us who cannot in this great emergency refrain from harping upon the wrongs committed by England in years ago. I have had Members on this Floor impress upon me in private conversation the story of England's treatment of Ireland in times past and I have heard it said time and again that England is the greatest conquering nation of all time. I hold no brief for England's wrongdoings. I do not want to condone nor forgive her for any of her mistakes. I loathe the thought of her weakness in the Spanish crisis and her appeasement at Munich.

We also hear much in the Congress about the conquests that England has made, especially of the Boers and India and other countries. I have no apologies to offer for the war party that went out to conquer the Boers of South Africa and the Government that imposed the opium war on China.

These aggressions of years gone by are no excuse today for Germany to conquer and subdue by conquest, deceit, and falsehood her highly civilized neighbors—France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway. We cannot excuse a wrong or a crime by citing another wrong and another crime. No one can justify the crimes committed by the German war machine by citing the wrongs committed by Great Britain.

England has kept open and free the trade routes of the world. England suggested to America the Monroe Doctrine, which we adopted as our own. England sent her discoverers, her explorers, into all parts of the world; they sailed the seven seas and spread the arts of civilization to the furthestmost corners of the earth. We speak the English language, we share their literary heritage, and we enjoy the English system of government and laws. I am not defending a single one of the crimes England committed in the past; but forget them, friends, and consider the present day, the present issue. Whose sons are now holding the blood-red, thin, wavering line on the battle fronts in western Europe? Those who are so bitter toward England do, I fear, love Hitler more.

FIRST WORLD WAR NOT FOUGHT IN VAIN

Many times I have heard it said in this House that we fought the first World War in vain—that we sent our boys overseas, where so many were lost and so many millions spent, and all for nothing. I do not believe that. I think we accom-

plished much by entering the first World War. We certainly prevented a German peace; and a German peace, had it been imposed upon Europe, would have wrecked all the countries outside of Germany.

It was a noble cause to which we gave our allegiance. We hoped to prevent the very thing which has come about and the situation which faces us today.

CONSISTENCY NOT ALWAYS A JEWEL

Many speeches have been made showing that men have changed their minds upon the very issues before us today. Yesterday I heard a colleague quote what Wendell Willkie said some months ago, showing it to be directly opposite to what he is saying now. Others have quoted inconsistencies of the President and various Members of Congress. That is not a weakness, my colleagues. Any thinking, open-minded man is likely to change his opinion. It is said that fools never do change their minds, but wise men sometimes do. Most of the men of the Continental Congress did not believe in independence when elected, but when the issue came they were not only for independence but they signed the document that meant hanging for them had the war party of England prevailed. Consistency, thou art a jewel! But the effort to be consistent may be carried so far that it renders a legislator useless for consideration of problems that are presented under changed circumstances and at different periods of time.

NEUTRALITY IMPOSSIBLE WHERE AGGRESSION IS CONCERNED

Neutrality is a fascinating word, and we all like to be neutral when neutrality means reasonableness and fairness. When a great contest is going on between right and wrong, and where aggression is concerned, there can be no neutrality. Most of the Members of the Congress, when they voted for the original Neutrality Act in 1935, believed they were voting for the wisest course our country could pursue. Neutrality not only kept us on the side lines, but it put us in a position of helping and assisting the aggressor nations.

We tried to be so neutral in the Asiatic struggle that we furnished oil, scrap iron, and copper to Japan—by the shipload. It is a well-known and acknowledged fact that Japan could not have carried on her war of aggression and conquest in China if it had not been for the unlimited stores we shipped to her, stores which she is using relentlessly to kill our friends on the China line, and has in reserve to use, perchance, against us. Such neutrality is but appeasement.

There can be no neutrals now. We have not been neutral in this war, especially since we passed the Lend-Lease Act. We then gave notice to the world that we would devote our factories to munitions and that we would run them 24-hour shifts to make guns and ammunition, to make airplanes and bombs, to meet the oncoming Nazi hordes. We are not only at the water's edge, but we are in the water. It is time for all real Americans to get behind this administration, which was chosen by our people at a free election for leadership in an impending crisis.

THE ESSENCE OF OUR FAITH

Hitler conquered France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway by dividing the sentiment in each country before his armed aggression struck, and that is precisely what he is trying to do in this country. Friends, you who are expecting to vote against the Senate amendments, and to leave in existence the fragments of the Neutrality Act, you are aiding the enemy, the enemy of civilization, the enemy of our America and our American ideals. Students of our War between the States can find in the histories scores of instances in which the critics of Lincoln appear in much the same light as the critics of President Roosevelt appear today. Who now remembers or respects Vallandigham or Fernando Wood? The so-called isolationists will also be forgotten when American institutions have safely outridden the storm and survived the terrible conflict that now rages over this earth.

What is the essence of our faith? The essence of our faith is found in the character and action of our great men who have led and molded opinion in America. It is drawn from the sacrifices of our people who have fought on every front and pioneered to establish this Nation. The essence of our faith is found in the documents of our liberties—the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the United States. The essence of our faith is found in the free enterprise, the reward for thought and toil, in the opportunity which is afforded through our form of government. The essence of our faith is found in our ideals and in our idealism.

WE MUST DEFEND OUR IDEALS—THIS IS THE TEST

Whether we adopt the Senate amendments is of small moment compared to the great events that lie ahead, but should the opposition succeed in defeating the proposals it will give great encouragement to Hitler and his gray-green legions. Unquestionably Japan will strike if she sees we are divided. We who believe in America are ready to give all we have for its defense. Many who are today criticizing will surely be found in the ranks of the defenders. Whatever may be the fate of this pending legislation, we will put up a strong fight and we will demonstrate that we are a united people. We are not going to quit. We are not going to surrender as France surrendered.

WHAT ABOUT SOUTH AMERICA?

It is, indeed, a problem unanswered today, and unanswerable, except by future events, what would be the effect in South America should Russia be compelled to make a separate peace and Great Britain be forced to her knees. What would then be the condition in the South American countries? I take it that no one believes that we will willingly submit to Hitler's dictation even if he becomes the world conqueror. Should that eventuality come to pass, then we must arm frantically; we must produce as never before. Clouds of airplanes, fleets of warships, and marching troops by the millions must then be our answer.

Recently a committee of this House made a trip through every country of South America. It is interesting to hear the story of what they saw and heard,

but, on sober thought, it only increases our anxiety as to what we may expect. Naturally South America falls into the European economy. They produce most of the things that we produce—cotton, corn, wheat, cattle—and their natural market is Europe. They want, in exchange, the products of industry Nazi Germany will be able to furnish them at prices with which we cannot compete, as she will have slave labor of conquered Europe.

Unquestionably the weak spot in defense on our continent is in Panama. It is freely stated that there are many hidden airplane landing fields in northern South America, already controlled by Nazi sympathizers. It is said that many Japanese airplanes have crossed the ocean and are concealed in some of these fields. If we should have difficulty with Japan, which we all must admit is possible, should the Nazi conquering hordes continue their conquests, one of the first things the Japanese would do, as they have told us plainly, would be to wreck the Panama Canal. They might do this with bomber planes raining shells so fast upon that weak line of our defense that it would not be possible for us to transfer our fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or from the Pacific to the Atlantic. The threat of war may make it necessary for us to double and quadruple our airplanes in the vicinity of Panama. It has been said that the German war party can take over some governments in northern South America in 24 hours if they so desire. Should that be true, then we are in danger of having seriously impaired this great channel which is so necessary to the defense of America.

JAPAN

We who live on the Pacific coast have for years known that Japan was ready at a moment's notice to conquer and claim the eastern shores of Asia, and today her armies are almost at the gates of Singapore and threaten to close the route to Vladivostok. Their Mission in this city today has informed our Department of State that we must withdraw from further aggression in the Pacific.

THE DIVIDING LINE

Ninety-nine years ago next May, the settlers in the Willamette Valley, Oreg., held a meeting at Champoe. They were debating whether they should organize a government and ask protection of Great Britain or of the United States, for at that time the country was under what was known as joint occupancy. The question was whether they should live under the Stars and Stripes or beneath the Union Jack. Tradition says that, after the debate had continued for some time, Big Joe Meek, the trapper, shouted, "Who's for a divide? All in favor of the report and an organization under the United States follow me."

He drew a line in the dust and across the line he went. When the milling about was over, 50 men were found on each side of the line. Two men, French Canadians, debated to which side of the line they should go. One was much opposed to the side of United States sovereignty because he had been told that the windows in his cabin would be taxed. The other French-

man convinced him that this was not true. They then both crossed the line and joined the Joe Meek crowd for the United States. It is immaterial whether the fate of Oregon was decided by this method or not. It is a typical western story, and I am not certifying as to its truth or falsity, but I use it now as a symbol. I say to you all that the dividing time is here, and the line is drawn. You are either for our American Government, our American ideals, and our American way of life, and you are then on our side, or you are for the Nazi ideal and you are on the side of Hitler. There can be no neutrals.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I have supported without exception all the defense and emergency measures, including the lend-lease bill. Although there was a hazard involved in some of the measures, I believe, and it has since been demonstrated, that the giving of aid to the countries fighting Hitlerism was conducive to the preservation of our free Nation. This was the theory advanced for the passage of most of the defense measures. I voted for each of the measures as steps to keep this country out of war and to avoid sending another force to Europe. I cannot apply that reasoning to the amendment now before us.

I voted for the bill which the House passed authorizing the arming of the merchant ships. The Senate has attached an amendment to the bill striking out the section of the Neutrality Act which prohibits American ships from entering the actual zones of conflict. By that amendment, which is now before us for consideration, we are asked to leave the policy of giving indirect aid and to go directly into a naval war. I say "directly into a naval war" because it is silly to say that the repeal of the combat-zone section of the Neutrality Act and the incident sending of our merchant ships with supplies of war under an American convoy into waters and ports in the immediate areas of conflict will not start naval battles between our ships and their convoys and ships and submarines participating in the blockade in the combat areas.

Much has been said about freedom of the seas. Does not freedom of the seas mean pursuit of normal trade over the globe? Does it mean conveying munitions of war into ports of warring nations?

In the naval battles that will follow the sending of our ships into the combat areas American ships will be sunk, emotional waves will sweep over this country, the battles and loss of American lives will take on proportions that will require our Government, if it is to maintain its national respect and integrity among nations and at home, to officially declare war.

The precedents of recorded history demonstrate that if a government does not maintain its national respect and integrity it soon becomes involved not only in external but in internal trouble and calamity.

It has been advanced that, even though a declaration of war should follow, there

will be no expeditionary force. When you once have a declaration of war or start fighting an undeclared war there are then no specifications or limitations that you can set up as a course that you will follow in fighting. You cannot then say you will only wage a defensive war or that you will only fight where it suits you best or where you prefer. You have to follow the tactical course through which victory is most assured whether that be an expeditionary force or not.

If Congress has to declare war and exercise the responsibility placed upon this body by the Constitution, then the prohibition of the Neutrality Act against sending our ships with munitions and supplies of war into battle zones could be and should be simultaneously repealed. The repeal of the war-zone provision now would, through a delegation of authority, start an undeclared war without the necessity of any further act of Congress.

Everyone knows that if our ships, with cargoes of munitions of war, start going into the now designated battle areas of the North Sea and the Mediterranean what will happen.

Our system of checks and balances between the different branches of our Government should be preserved and the power to commence and pursue war should be retained in Congress.

There has been discussion as to our fulfilling our commitments. The Congress has not, and I certainly have not, made any commitment to deliver the aid that has been sought of us into battle ports. The Congress, in which I joined, committed itself only to manufacture the goods. The sole question of this amendment is, Shall we give further trial to the legislative policy of giving aid to the nations fighting Hitler, or shall we abandon that course and start delivering aid into the war ports? At the moment I do not believe that the possibilities of keeping this course have been sufficiently exhausted to justify voting for war, which this amendment amounts to.

I intend to continue to vote for and advocate measures that will build up and expedite our national defense. The situation in the world is such that there is no course that is a perfect course.

There is a wide and diversified but conscientious difference of opinion among the Members of this House as to how to best accomplish the common objective of every Member of this body—the peace and liberty of America. We are now and will be called to vote upon momentous and far-reaching fundamentals. World events may take such a course that, in order to preserve the liberty of this country, war may become inevitable. If it does, it is the constitutional obligation of Congress to meet it.

There is a lot of extremist propaganda floating around the country, some advocating war, some advocating isolation. We can best meet our obligation in Congress by maintaining a deliberate prospective and, without emotion and without regard to personal consequences, pass upon defense problems in what we think is in the best interests of America.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, these perilous times call for the exertion of our every effort for national defense. I have long recognized the need of such defense as my record of votes in this House and as my words upon the floor have indicated in no uncertain terms. When the danger of war first became apparent I felt that our best defense would be a powerful army and navy that would be large enough and strong enough to defeat any navy or combination of navies in the world whether on the Atlantic or the Pacific or both. To the end that we might have a strong defense I voted for the Selective Service and Training Act because I felt that the defense of the country should not be left to those alone who were patriotic enough to volunteer for service, but that the obligation rested squarely and equally upon all. I voted for lend-lease bill No. 1 because I sincerely believed that in sending war materials to the nations fighting the aggressor countries, we were buying time to prepare our own defense. How sound that judgment was is evidenced by the fact that time alone, above all things, was what we needed most for even yet we have not reached the perfection of war strength which would definitely and certainly mean victory if attacked. I have voted for every appropriation bill that would enable us to prepare our defenses adequately and for the tax bills which would raise the moneys needed for such defense. I voted for the draft-extension bill because I was firmly convinced that the Chief of Staff of the United States Army would not have urged its passage unless it had been necessary. I voted for lend-lease bill No. 2 in the hope and expectation that our aid would be extended to Russia—not by any means because of my sympathy with the principles of that government—but with cold-blooded calculation that the greater the losses inflicted upon Germany, the farther away would be the war from us. Perhaps I have been too calculating, but if I am, God knows that every government of Europe is thinking only of itself and, frankly, I am only thinking of the United States and our American youth. I voted to arm American flag merchantmen sailing the seas within the limits allowed under our neutrality law, because I felt that whatever the effectiveness of such arming as a means of defense might be, at least it gave our seamen a fighting chance to defend themselves against piratical submarines. Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress has more consistently voted for national defense than I, but in my opinion this is not a defense bill; this is a war resolution and I shall not vote for it. It is a plunge into the war which it is not necessary at this time, in my opinion, for us to take and for which we are presently unprepared. Pass this bill to permit our merchantment to go through the combat zone to belligerent ports and it will only be a matter of days before the American Navy will be convoying, through the German blockade, not only American merchantmen, but the ships of other nations, including Great Britain as well. "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." Once before we did the same thing

and we bought into World War 1. If we do it again we will be in World War 2 in a short time. Remember this—that when we vote on this resolution, our votes will determine not only whether our American Navy will convoy merchant ships through the combat zone into belligerent ports but also whether our Navy will soon convoy transport ships for a second A. E. F.

To me it is inescapable, that if our armed merchantmen, convoyed as they will be by our Navy, attempt to run the blockade around British ports, war will follow and we are not prepared for such a war. Our own plans do not contemplate adequate defense for at least 2 or 3 years. Can we, with impunity plunge our country into war when we are not prepared for it? Our people do not want war and they look to this House to keep them out of war if it is humanly possible to do so. I feel that I would be recreant in my duty if I did not oppose, with all my might, any measure which I thought would inevitably lead to war, when there is another road which we might honorably take and which would keep us out of war.

I have said that this resolution is unnecessary at this time. In this House, less than 30 days ago, at the request of the President, we passed a bill to authorize the arming of our merchant ships which operated in the waters limited by the Neutrality Act. What has happened in the last 30 days to necessitate this resolution? Has Britain, in that time, lost so heavily in the Atlantic that American ships are now needed to carry material to them? If that is so how do we account for the return of 40 of the 50 tankers which were loaned to them recently. If that be so how do those who are in favor of this bill account for the announcement from London, which appeared in the New York Times this morning, that war-risk rates for ships and cargoes between the Americas and Britain were yesterday reduced 25 percent? We have given Great Britain 50 destroyers and our Navy only recently announced that it would shortly begin the construction of 50 escort vessels for Great Britain. If we give warships to Great Britain what hindrance is there to giving them merchant ships? The only answer that I can find is that this bill has not for its primary purpose the sending of American merchant ships through the combat zone into belligerent ports but has for its underlying reason the sending of our American Navy into the combat zone which we, ourselves, established for our safety and thus plunge us into the war.

We have not been informed as to the amount of war material that has been lost in transit to Britain. We have no information as to what war material if any is now lying on our docks awaiting shipment and delayed for lack of carriers. For all we know all our shipments have been carried over without delay and with little loss.

How can we, Members of Congress, live with our consciences if we take this unnecessary step which will eventually lead us into war and we later learn that our material had been carried to Britain with little or no loss? It will be little consolation

tion for us to say, "If I had only known the facts," when we see the Gold Star Mothers of World War No. 2 grief stricken at the loss of their boys in a conflict that might have been avoided.

It will be of little consolation for us, when in the quietude of our own homes we say to ourselves "God, if I had only known" as we think of our boys somewhere asleep in the deep or at rest in unmarked graves in the frozen ground of Russia or the burning sands of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution definitely leads to war. I shall vote against it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during my long period of service no question has been presented to Congress to which I have given more attention than the pending resolution, including the Senate amendments. I have thoroughly studied and considered the proposed changes in the Neutrality Act, as well as the existing situation, and it is my conclusion that further revision of the law is absolutely necessary.

We have learned that a state of war is something that is ever changing and it is always in motion. The circumstances and facts that existed at the time the act was passed, over 2 years ago, have entirely changed. Germany is no longer at war with England and France, but is now at war with England and Russia; and over a dozen nations of Europe have fallen victims of Germany's conquest. Recent events justify the statement that Germany is now engaged in an undeclared war on the United States. Germany has destroyed our merchant ships as well as naval vessels in neutral zones. That leads me to say no one knows where this so-called combat zone is, if one exists. I am of the opinion it is anywhere that Hitler's navy and planes desire to go. In other words, the entire Atlantic Ocean is a combat zone. I think Hitler would just as soon sink one of our ships within the 3-mile limit, if he could, as he would to destroy our ships off the coast of Africa. The activities of foreign submarines during the past few weeks, not far from our eastern coast, is further evidence that Hitler's combat zones consist of the entire Atlantic Ocean.

Let me admit I, like a lot of others, did not conceive of Hitler attacking our vessels, but time has shown this was wrong.

Let us not forget we are constructing naval bases far from our shores. I would not be surprised at anything Hitler would do. Assume he would declare the area to be in the combat zone. Would you want to discontinue supplying those bases?

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of taking the American flag off the Atlantic Ocean.

From the experience of the defeated countries in Europe a mere protest will not stop Hitler's program of destruction of our ships. Our protests go unheeded. One of the first laws of nature is that of self-defense and I am therefore in favor of arming our ships to give our sailors a chance to protect themselves.

Further, I am not in favor of recognizing a combat zone that Hitler creates that will extend throughout the Atlantic

Ocean, which he has done in fact. He has clearly demonstrated that what he calls his combat zones have no limitations and to grant him permission to carry on his operations all over the Atlantic Ocean will simply be granting permission to extend his combat zones wherever and whenever he pleases.

Finally let me say, it is my opinion I can conceive of nothing that would bolster the morale of Germany more than the defeat of this resolution.

I therefore propose to support the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker—

There's but the twinkling of a star
Between a man of peace and war.

—Butler Hudibras.

It is with profound regret and with exceeding heaviness of heart that I have come to the conclusion that I cannot rationalize to myself a vote in support of the Senate amendments. Though I personally voted when this bill was originally in the House for the simple act to enable the arming of American merchantmen while operating outside of war zones, I cannot justify a vote upon the additional amendments which were added by the Senate.

I reiterate the arguments which were offered by the eloquent and brilliant gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM] when he deplored the method by which such amendments were added by action of the Senate. No hearings have been granted by the appropriate committees in either House on these far-reaching Senate amendments.

I join with the erudite and very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH] in the points which he covered so tellingly and so persuasively in his inspiring talk.

There are only two things worth fighting for. One is defense of our homes. The other is the Bill of Rights. War for any other cause is simply a racket. The trouble with America is that the dollar gets restless when it earns only 6 percent over here. It goes overseas to get 100 percent. The flag follows the money—and the soldiers follow the flag. (General Smedley Butler.)

Something has been said about freedom of the seas in this discussion. It might be well for us for a moment to recall what happened to the freedom-of-the-seas doctrine. Woodrow Wilson promulgated freedom of the seas as 1 of the 14 points upon which the Allies sought a peace conference with the Germans at the end of World War No. 1. It was upon the basis of protection and guaranty of freedom of the seas as 1 of the 14 points that that war was concluded.

Must there always be war? Of course it is hard to think that children are born in this world and men and women live for nothing else than to be slaughtered wholesale in a thousand ghastly ways. (Clarence Darrow.)

What occurred then? We learn that the English, and the French, and the Italians refused to accept the amendment drawn on freedom of the seas, omitted and ignored it absolutely in the Treaty of Versailles. This statement is taken from the book entitled "The After-

math" by Winston Churchill, published in 1929. So it was Great Britain herself who repudiated the doctrine of freedom of the seas; and naturally so because England has always contended that she was the mistress of the seas. Her favorite song has been "Britannia Rules the Waves."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. In 5 minutes I can hardly yield. I regret it, but I must decline.

"It is 18 years," I cried. "You must come no more."

We know your names. We know that you are the dead.

Must you march forever from France and the last, blind war?"

"Fool! From the next!" they said.

—Stephen Vincent Benét, 1936.

It would be rather an anomalous thing for us to expect that Great Britain should accept the doctrine of the freedom of the seas which she has denied for more than 200 years to other nations of the world.

A long while ago an old Persian poet wrote a quatrain which runs like this:

Ah! Love, could you and I with him conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits, and then
Remould it nearer to the heart's desire?

There are those men in high places today who would live up to that admonition and would attempt to remold this sorry scheme of things throughout the world nearer to the heart's desire. The Bible says: "Can ye not discern the signs of the time when the skies are red and lowering?" Yes. The signs of the times are that the American people by an overwhelming mandate manifested, on innumerable occasions and in varied ways, their antipathy to our entry into this war by a majority of at least 4 to 1. The Democratic Party and the Republican Party enunciated that belief in no uncertain terms.

Day after day and night after night their candidates for the Presidency assured the American people that they were opposed to steps leading to war. They promised to keep the American people from being involved in war. In the Democratic platform there is such a plank. The Republican platform contains such a plank. Their candidates endorsed that pronouncement. Every one of our Members who ran for Congress in 1940 told your voters out in your respective districts that you were opposed to steps leading to war.

So far as business and money are concerned, a country gains nothing by a successful war, even though that war involves the acquisition of immense new provinces. (Havelock Ellis, the Task of Social Hygiene.)

Believing as I do that these Senate amendments opening the doors wide to sending our armed merchantmen into blockade zones and into belligerent ports, mean going into war, and are tantamount to a declaration of war, I am compelled reluctantly and after much misgiving to oppose my party's leadership and my President, for whom I entertain the greatest affection. I pledged my people that I would oppose amending the neutrality bill when I ran for reelection in 1940; and on the basis of that promise I received one of the largest majorities

accorded any Democratic candidate for Congress north of the Mason and Dixon's line.

I pledged to my people that I would oppose repeal of the Neutrality Act. I told them without reservation that I would do my utmost, should they elect me again as a Member of Congress, to persuade my fellows to oppose steps I sincerely believed would bring about our involvement—involuntarily be it said—in war; to participation, all out, in which four out of five of the American people are opposed. That is the way I feel about this bill. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to emasculating, eviscerating, and a fortiori abolishing the Neutrality Act.

War scares are good, real wars will be better. Let there be no mistake about it. Arms dealers want war. They are hypocrites if they deny this. War is to them what milk is to a baby. They fatten on it. They fatten on it like pigs in corn. (John Gunther, *Inside Europe*.)

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Washington 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to include in my remarks certain quotations from leading essayists, statesmen, writers, and historians of the country expatiating upon the folly of America's entry into World War No. 1, and quotations from speeches made on Armistice Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SILENT LEGES INTER ARMA (THE LAW IS SILENT DURING WAR)—CICERO

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. What about international law? We have only had it since 1625. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has frequently, learnedly, discussed this subject. A man named Grotius, over in Holland, wrote a book called *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis*, which might be translated from the Latin as concerning the law of war and peace. International law was honored and respected generally until it was universally flouted in 1914-18 by all belligerents. Since then international law has been a snare, a misnomer, and an illusion because a nation which is a belligerent frequently ignores international law. Every nation when it is in desperation avoids or repudiates international law. Great Britain has done it repeatedly in this war, as have the unspeakable Nazis, Fascists, and their allies.

I am tired and sick of war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell. (General Sherman.)

Germany has done it repeatedly in this war. Each of the nations does it when it is desperate, so we cannot arrogate to ourselves any particular superiority on this matter of international law. When we wrote in the lend-lease bill the power to arm and repair British ships in American shipyards, we violated one of the cardinal tenets of international law. In

1871 Great Britain paid the United States \$15,000,000 for having armed and outfitted the Confederate raider *Alabama*, which was thereby recognized as a gross violation of international law. Yet today we are doing that for which we held Great Britain culpable in the *Alabama* case. We are repairing and outfitting British warships in American ports.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to cite one thing before I conclude. Something has been said about the lend-lease bill and our efforts to get the goods over to Great Britain. I despise Hitler as much as any man on this floor and I loathe all of his works, but I remind you that in the lend-lease bill there were two little sentences in connection with conveying and in connection with opening the door of the Neutrality Act.

Section (d) of the lend-lease bill reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of conveying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

That is the law of the land. Is its spirit going to be maintained now? It is no mandatory prohibition, but it is expressive of intent.

Section (e) of this same act reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

That was a solemn expression of this Congress adopted a few months ago in the lend-lease bill. In order to get that bill through then leaders had to reassure the Members of Congress that they were not going to open the door of the Neutrality Act.

War is the most ghastly experience that can come to any country. And always it is the people—not the handful of men in positions of power—who must pay the full price. The price in dollars and cents. The price in dismembered families. The price in heart agonies. The price in bodily suffering. The price in numbed minds. The price in precious human lives. The price in putting together the Nation's pieces afterwards. Always it is the masses who pay. (The late Robert M. La Follette, Sr.)

Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled and deeply worried by the almost complete and exclusive preoccupation of our governmental authorities with so-called national defense and matters related to the international situation. Recognizing as I do the gravity of the world scene today, I contend it is vital to our morale and our national esprit de corps that we assure those on the home front here in this country that we are not letting the people down. I have not forgotten the forgotten man. I am still oppressed and depressed by the spectacle of the one-third who are or were ill housed and underfed. The United States Census of 1940 shows that we have three and three-quarter million families—not individuals but families—who receive per family an income of \$25 or less per month, and that 67 percent of

all the families in our land derive an income of less than \$100 per month per family. We have our hands full to guarantee to our indigent, our needy, our elderly, our blind and crippled the benefits of the four freedoms here. Charity begins at home.

One of the four freedoms is freedom from want. Let us demonstrate we can extend that to Americans. We have a big order to fill in relation to our tenant farmers and sharecroppers and migratory workers. We have overlooked for too long providing justice to the Negro. Let us assure to the Negro, the alien, the Jew freedom from fear—fear of discrimination and bigotry.

Ah, my colleagues, let no one delude you into the hallucination that our people at home entertain any burning yearning for war. They want no war for us. They are unalterably opposed to the execrable Hitler and his infamies, blasphemies, and pogroms. They condemn and condemn, revile, and exorcise this despicable catiff and his indescribably foul ilk. Americans sympathize with the victims of aggression. Their heart is wrung by the inspiring spectacle of heroic English citizens holding their heads up and proceeding calmly about their business during bombing attacks. Their beings exult when they read of the brave Chinese fighting the Japanese, with the odds against them. We glory in the intrepidity of the Russians magnificently resisting the Nazi hordes seeking to destroy ruthlessly their homes and farms. No nation in history has ever proved its courage and its character more truly than has the Russian, in defending its lares and penates against despoliation. We are appalled by the frightful cruelties of war. We have shown we wish ample and generous material aid to be delivered to Great Britain and her allies. We want Great Britain and her allies to win. We pray for the destruction of fascism and its brutal exponents. But we have said we will give aid without stint, short of war. Mr. Speaker, mark those words, "short of war."

With supreme irony, the war to "make the world safe for democracy" ended by leaving democracy more unsafe in the world than at any time since the collapse of the revolution of 1848. (James H. Robinson, *The Human Comedy*.)

There has been no referendum for war, nor will the authorities permit such a referendum resolution to be considered. The only ostensibly authentic expression we have had is through the media of Gallup and other polls, all of which reveal, yet, a devastatingly shattering majority of our people opposed to our entry now into this war and likewise opposed to sending to Europe any expeditionary forces. Believing as I do that these Senate amendments are the prelude to such expeditionary forces and that these amendments are a ratification of conveying and an open sesame to participation in an all-out shooting war, I am constrained to oppose them.

This issue should be candidly discussed and debated, to wit, a declaration of war. Lord Beaverbrook and Premier Winston Churchill already regard us as in, but I

prognosticate will regard a majority vote on the pending measure, embracing these amendments as equivalent to a declaration of war.

We are mad, not only individually, but nationally. We check manslaughter and isolated murders; but what of war and the much-vaunted crime of slaughtering whole peoples?

SENECA

No one can accuse me of being a partisan of Hitler. I am descended from a long line of English, Northern Irish, and Scotch ancestors. It would be a deep blow were our English cousins to be defeated. Hence I have favored tendering them vast material aid, but aid, short of war. No one, anywhere, at any time, in these United States, has received authority or a mandate from the people to push us into this conflict. No twisting of facts or specious ratiocinations will persuade the intelligent that we are as yet justified in joining England and her allies now as cobelligerents.

With due respect and deference to my colleagues who differ with me, I shall be true to my conscience and faithful to the trust reposed in me by the all too inarticulate masses at home, and do my utmost to keep America out of war.

God, give us men to keep the faith and measure up to the trust. The people are becoming soured and disillusioned as to their elected officials. They are in some instances a prey to dangerous moods. I tremble for the future at times. Are we paving the way for a man on horseback, by giving our constituents the impression that their Congressmen cannot keep their promises when the going gets hard and the pressures become feverish? Ah, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that our people do not lose that faith. Without it, all is lost in a democracy. A pledge is something to be kept unless something of frightful magnitude and of unpredictable portending supervenes. I shall sleep at night after this vote. My conscience will be clear. I can opine that I have fought the good fight and that I have kept the faith.

Our first duty is to our own country, not to some other, no matter how our hearts move in sympathy with it. Regardless of the travail, suffering, and woes besetting our neighbors, we dare not jeopardize the security, the solvency, the safety of these United States, by voluntarily dissipating its strength and its resources in such a manner as will menace our very continued existence as a Nation.

God, give us bigger men! Across life's stage Strut pigmy creatures, heroes of an hour, Thirsting for glory, hungering for praise, And panting in their haste to gather power.

God, give us men whose souls are large enough

To tread the lowly paths in step with Thee, Seeking Thy glory, not their own; Thy praise, No vain applause and cheap publicity.

God, give us men; those tall enough to see Above their own ambitions, to descry The good the other fellow does, and view Another's work with an unjaundiced eye.

God, give us men anxious of Thee to claim, "Thy gentleness hath made me great"; to be Made strong enough to walk among the weak With graciousness, kindness, and courtesy.

—J. B., in the Australian Victory.

Indeed, yes; let us have men, big men, brave men, courageous men, possessing the courage of their convictions. Did you, my colleagues, stop ever to consider why it is that men like the late Borah, of Idaho, and the current NORRIS, of Nebraska, remain here through the years, towering like giant cypresses against the troubled sky? Because they were big men, honest men, humble men, men whom the people loved for their courage, for their bulldog tenacity, and, above all, for their having the courage of their convictions.

When we, the workers, all demand:

"What are we fighting for?"

Then, then we'll end that stupid crime,

That devil's madness—war.

—R. W. Service—Michael.

We hear much of civilian defense these days. Our neighbors are being taught the intricacies of forfending against thermite bombs, and told how to hedge against dropping missiles and how to operate in a black-out. The ladies are shown attractive uniforms which they are admonished are important to civilian morale. Many varieties of uniforms, the wearing of which now, in advance of actual participation in the conflict, is calculated to stir the war-mindedness and bellicosity of our people. I do not pass on the merits of these efforts, timely as they may be. But I point out that on the Pacific Coast our people would feel more enthused about civilian-defense programs if they knew there were any anti-aircraft guns in place, or even readily available, to protect their cities from possible air attack. If the menace of such an invasion is so near, would it not be advisable to equip ourselves and put in place ample anti-aircraft guns? Why not construct at least some air-raid shelters if we are about to be invaded? Why not provide civilian gas masks and drill the people in their use? All these things Great Britain did before she declared war upon the Nazis.

But war's a game, which, were their subjects wise, kings would not play at.

—Cowper, The Task.

All my life I have favored peace, Mr. Speaker. I have been a member of peace societies. I have read omnivorously of history. I have followed generals through their campaigns, while studying their tactics in books. I have gone over battlefields. But I am convinced of the futility of war as a means of accomplishing anything. I may be converted. There may approach an hour when we all must agree that war is the only alternative, but not a war which we must go overseas to engage in, not a war which we must seek, provoke or enter into without valid justification.

Let us tell the people the unvarnished truth. Let us not kid them. Proponents of the instant bill in this debate have alternately stated that they favored the Senate amendments because they would tend to keep us out of war while other champions of the measure have asseverated that we are already in the war, and the defeat of this bill would be like surrendering. Who is right? Either we are now at war or we are not. Not by my vote are we in any war. Let us have done with deception. Let us give heed to the biblical injunction:

Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye free.

I have always supported all measures for our own national defense and have voted for appropriations for vast material aid to Britain and her allies, but I still adhere to my pledge to my home people to work for keeping our country out of war.

War, war is still the cry, "War even to the knife!"

—Byron, Child Harold.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; in song and story war has been apotheosized. The world has been flooded with legends deifying war's leaders. The glamor of war oft adumbrates the untinsel attractions of peace, just as excitement attracts with infinitely more magnetism than do the calm, sobriety, and judicial equanimity of peace. "Peace rules the day, where reason rules the mind," said Collins in Eclogue II of Hassan.

But dream not helm and harness

The sign of valor true;

Peace hath higher tests of manhood

Than battle ever knew.

—John G. Whittier, The Hero.

And so once more men will be made savage, fierce, and brutal, and love will wane in the world. . . . And so once more the men who reaped profit from it all will assert with assurance that since there has been a war there must needs have been one, and that other wars must follow, and they will again prepare future generations for a continuance of slaughter, depriving them from their birth. (Tolstoy, The Coming of War.)

Away with themes of war, away with war itself!

Hence from my shuddering sight, to never more return, that show of blacken's mutilated corpses!

That hell unpent, and raid of blood—fit for wild tigers, or for lop-tongued wolves—not reasoning men!

And in its stead speed industry's campaigns. With thy undaunted armies, engineering! Thy pennants, Labor, loosen'd to the breeze! They bugles sounding loud and clear.

—Walt Whitman.

One to destroy is murder by the law, And gibbets keep the lifted hand in awe; To murder thousands takes a specious name, War's glorious art, and gives immortal fame.

—Edward Young, Love of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago a prominent Prussian, General von Bernhardi, wrote a book entitled "Deutschland und der Nächste Krieg" which attempted to prove that war is a biological necessity for any nation, and that virility of a country's manhood is thereby assured. Some contemporaries in this country extolled that writer and expanded on the theme. The view has many adherents to this day. But in 1912 there appeared the greatest work ever written on the accomplishments of follies of war. It was The Great Illusion, by Sir Norman Angell. This latter volume was printed in more than 70 editions in over 55 languages and dialects. It proved irrefutably the economic futility of war. It showed that all modern wars are illusory and frightfully costly to the victors. All modern victories are pyrrhic. In 1913 Jacques Novikow wrote his monumental thesis War and Its Alleged Benefits. In this work M. Novikow incontestably proved that war ran contrary to science and that while civilization sought to preserve and main-

tain life, war strove to destroy it. War controverted the struggle of Nature as expounded by Charles Darwin, "the survival of the fittest," for war insures the survival of the physically unfit. In war we select the best mental and physical specimens and send them against the tanks, the flame throwers, the poison gas, the machine gun. Great God, Mr. Speaker, are we going to be credulous again and succumb to propaganda?

War is a frightful thing to contemplate and the responsibility for plunging this great peace-loving Nation into the sanguinary shambles of the second world holocaust in 25 years is a responsibility terrible to assume.

Are we ready? Decidedly not. Shall we send our raw recruits against the seasoned veterans of the greatest military machine in the history of the world without counting the cost? Can this Nation emerge as a democracy? Can anyone predict or even calculate approximately the scores of billions which this war will cost us? Will all private wealth be extirpated? Whence will come the untold dollars required to pay bonuses, compensation allowances, disability benefits, pensions, inevitable after this war concludes?

Give me the money that has been spent in war, and I will clothe every man, woman, and child in an attire of which kings and queens would be proud. I will build a schoolhouse in every valley over the whole earth. I will crown every hillside with a place of worship consecrated to the gospel of peace. (Charles Sumner.)

Time does not permit me to dilate upon our chances of landing an expeditionary force on the Eastern Hemisphere nor the preparations requisite as a condition precedent to such a venture.

I believe it would be helpful to the House and the country if I should attach hereinbelow trenchant excerpts from observations of leading thinkers, veterans, statesmen, historians, preachers, teachers, and men of letters in connection with the wisdom of our participation in World War No. 1 and the results unhappily derived therefrom. In the language of the classical lawyer in describing this series: "Res ipsa loquitur."

Barnes, Harry Elmer, historian: "If man could learn anything from history, our experience in the first World War ought to be a sufficient lesson to us as to the futility of entering another armed crusade to make the world safe for democracy and the other civilized decencies."

Source: French, Paul C., editor: *Common-Sense Neutrality*, New York, 1939, page 14.

Blake, Mrs. Della T., past national commander, American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.: "It has been proved conclusively and without question that the last World War, far from ending war or making the world safe for democracy, has bred hate, tyranny, and more war."

Source: French, Paul C., editor, *Common-Sense Neutrality*, New York, 1939, page 44.

Borah, William E., Senator from Idaho: "Twenty years ago we went into Europe to take part in a European war. We went with high hopes and, in my opinion, for ample cause. But, even so, how futile the sacrifices we made. Scarcely had the heroic story of our soldiers been written before the so-called peace treaties had set at naught the principles for which our soldiers fought."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939; Appendix, page 80. Washington, 1939.

Borah, William E., Senator from Idaho: "We went into a foreign war, a war having its roots in wholly foreign policies. We left our dead on foreign soil. The policies of those countries remain the same. Europe is no nearer peace than before. We have our dead and crippled, our maimed and insane, our wretched and twisted institutions, while Europe retained her bitterness, her dissension, her old balance of power."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939; Appendix, page 326 (article by Richard L. Neuberger inserted in RECORD by Hon. H. D. ANGELL, of Oregon). Washington, 1939.

Butler, Nicholas Murray, prominent educator: "Those 4 years of devastating war and their appalling losses were all in vain. History does not record any more convincing evidence of the futility of war. The nations which were associated together as victors are now seen to have lost everything for which they fought and made such stupendous sacrifice, while those who, as aggressors and in violation of treaties, by the invasion of Belgium commenced hostilities and were after 4 years defeated, are now seen to have won everything for which they then contended and much more."

Source: Butler, Nicholas Murray, *Why War?* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, page 121.

Butler, Nicholas Murray: "The futility of war has never been more clearly demonstrated than by the Great War of 1914-18 and its results. Colossal as was the destruction of human life and human property, appalling as was the exhausting of the savings of mankind through the centuries, it is now perfectly plain, that every single end was lost for which those allied nations which are supposed to have won the war carried on that conflict. The nations which were supposedly defeated at the time of Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, and the terms of whose defeat were recorded in the treaties of Versailles, of the Trianon and St. Germain, are now in possession of everything for which they fought in the Great War and much more besides."

Source: Butler, Nicholas Murray, *Why War?* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, page 208.

CAPPER, ARTHUR, Senator from Kansas: "The disillusionment that started in 1919 was a bitter one. The millions of boys, the billions and tens of billions of dollars that went to Europe to fight for democracy in 1917 and 1918 won the war for those who talked of democracy—but they didn't save democracy."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939, Washington, 1939, Appendix, page 88.

Chadwick, Steven F., former commander, American Legion: "The disillusionment experienced in this country after the conclusion of the World War, in which our men gave their lives or risked their lives to 'make the world safe for democracy' or to 'fight a war to end all wars,' looms as a warning today to all who would have us participate in world conflicts."

Source: United States Congress, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, hearings to promote the defense of the United States, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, Washington, 1941, part 2, page 568.

CLARK, BENNETT C., Senator from Missouri, on Veterans of Foreign Wars radio hour: "Our membership looks upon the twin questions of neutrality and the taking of profits out of war with the hard practical realism of men who in times of national stress have been prepared to bare their breasts to the storm, who

understand from actual experience what war is, who lost any romanticism on the subject in the bitter crucible of war itself, who realize that the desperate disaster of depression from which the country has been suffering is but the aftermath of the last war."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, part 11, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, January 3-March 28, 1939, Washington, 1939, Appendix, page 1012 (inserted by Senator H. T. BONE, of Washington).

Coolidge, Calvin, ex-President: "We are celebrating the twelfth anniversary of Armistice Day. As the war recedes into the past the material loss becomes more apparent. The destruction of life, the maimed and the orphaned reaching many millions, the loss of scores of billions of property, the crushing debts and taxation, and the human misery of the time which will be projected into the distant future reveal what a crime it was to permit such a catastrophe to envelop the world. No nation profited by it."

If there was any gain, it must be sought for in spiritual values. Even those appear to be diminishing. The unselfish, patriotic fervor of that day has suffered a relapse. Instead of a willingness to give all for one's country, there is too much disposition in the world to avoid meeting all the different kinds of national obligations here and abroad imposed by the war. People should realize that they cannot be avoided. In some way they will have to be discharged. The nations can only recover from the war by a continuous exhibition of the spirit of sacrifice which those terrible times produced. Unless the increased moral power then created is preserved, the war will be a total loss."

Source: Washington Post, November 11, 1930, page 1.

Dennis, Lawrence, member E. A. Pierce & Co., writer: "We fought it in 1917, to make the world safe for democracy, to establish the rule of law. The war produced communism and fascism and nazi-ism, and it was an unqualified failure from every point of view, but now we have to fight it again."

Source: United States Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearings, American neutrality policy, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, Washington, 1939, page 373.

Fosdick, Harry E., pastor, Riverside Church, New York: "The last war, fought for democracy, destroyed more democracy than any Genghis Khan in history ever did, and this war threatens to match its record."

Source: Baird, A. Craig, Representative American Speeches, 1939-40. New York, 1940, page 435.

Grattan, C. Hartley, prominent author: "It wasn't the going to Europe and engaging in the fighting of the first World War that disillusioned us; rather, it was the peace that followed after. It was our failure to solve Europe's problems. The Versailles Peace Conference of 1919, the findings of the Nye Committee, the well-ventilated scandals of administrative incompetence in the State Department, the story of excessive regard for special domestic economic interests during the war period—these were the things that really disillusioned us. The moral certainty about the issues of the war which carried us so joyously to the battlefields turned out to have been founded on rather smelly quicksand."

Source: Grattan, C. Hartley, *The Deadly Parallel*, New York, 1939, pages 169-170.

Harding, W. G., November 11, 1921: "Here in the United States we are but freshly turned from the burial of an unknown American soldier, when a Nation sorrowed while paying him tribute. Whether it was spoken or not, a hundred millions of our people were summarizing the inexcusable causes, the incalculable cost, the unspeakable sacrifices, and the unutterable sorrows; and there was the ever-impelling question, How can humanity justify or God forgive? Human hate

demands no such toll; ambition and greed must be denied it. If misunderstanding must take the blame, then let us banish it."

Source: Adams, Samuel H., *The Incredible Era*, Boston, 1939, page 247.

Herring, Hubert, writer: "We paid for the war. We paid with the lives of the 126,000 dead, of the 234,300 mutilated and wounded. We paid with the dislocated lives of hundreds of thousands whom the war wrenched from their accustomed places in a peaceful world. We paid in the imponderable damage to our national morale through the lashing of war hysteria. We paid with a period of economic confusion from which we have not yet escaped. The direct bill for the war has reached the figure of \$55,000,000,000. The indirect bill can never be reckoned."

Source: Herring, Hubert, *And So to War*, New Haven, 1938, page 20.

Holmes, John Haynes, prominent minister of New York City in speech on subject *As We Move Toward War*; *Some Plain Talk in an Hour of Peril*: "But the last war was so described—as a war for democracy, for civilization, for everything that was precious in our American way of life. And we sent our boys across the seas and suffered more than 250,000 casualties, and threw away over \$20,000,000,000. And when it was all over, we discovered in the peace settlement that it concerned nothing that was of any interest to us at all."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 86, page 6058. (Inserted by Senator R. D. Holt, of West Virginia.)

Hoover, Herbert, former President of the United States: " * * * Youth made the supreme sacrifice who could have furnished genius and guidance to our people. War placed nearly half a million persons on the national pension list—and the day will come when the number will be many times that. It cost us a huge burden of taxation which will drain our standard of living for generations."

"And there were other costs. To fight the war we inflated credit, prices, and ideas, which had to bump down to earth with immense losses to our farmers and unemployment to our workers. Out of the war expansion of industry we had years of maladjustment. * * * Ever since the war we have lived in a hectic economic world."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939; Washington, 1939; Appendix, page 560. (Inserted by Representative C. A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont.)

Hughes, Charles E., former Chief Justice: "The war to end war has left its curse of hate, its lasting injuries, its breeding grounds of strife; and to secure an abiding peace appears to be more difficult than ever."

Source: Hughes, Charles E., *The Pathway of Peace*, New York, 1925, page 4.

Johnson, Hugh S.: "Not a vestige of our aims remains to reward us for all our sacrifice. We were bamboozled in the beginning and defrauded in the end. Faith in the promises of nations seemed vanished from the earth. No pot can call any kettle black. Poland and Czechoslovakia will as bitterly accuse Britain and France of double-crossing and running out as they will accuse Germany and Russia. They two-timed us on the debts and threw us a curve on the post-war peace pacts—especially in Manchuria. Nice people. Every principle for which we went to war is a mouthful of dust and burned-out ashes."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939; Washington, 1939; Appendix, page 96. (Inserted by Hon. H. C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho.)

Kelly, Raymond J., former national commander of the American Legion: "We of the Legion, of all groups in America, have better first-hand knowledge of the real meaning of

war in terms of broken bodies and shattered nerves. We, perhaps better than other Americans, can declare with vigor and meaning that we are against war for America because we know what it does to men and women. We served in the last war, because we believed we were fighting for an ideal and for peace throughout the world. * * * But because of our first-hand experiences in the last war, we say in all sincerity that our place is not on the battlefields of Europe; that the destiny of American youth is here in this land."

Source: French, Paul Comly, editor, *Common Sense Neutrality*, New York, 1939, page 143.

La Follette, Robert M., Senator from Wisconsin: "Our great venture into international cooperation in 1917 ended with the economic interests of the great nations determined to wipe out German competition. This course blasted the foundations for peace in the world."

Source: Baird, A. Craig, Representative American Speeches: 1937-38. New York, 1938, pages 73-74.

Landon, Alfred M., Republican Presidential candidate, 1936: "After the amazing achievement of putting 2,000,000 soldiers on European soil, after we had won the war for our Allies, they sprung their secret treaties on us. They ignored, in these treaties, the 14 points which Woodrow Wilson had held up to the Central Powers as the basis on which the German people could surrender. Our Allies, too, had given their tacit approval to these points, since they had helped to publicize them among the German people. Therefore, in comparison with our part in winning the war, the secret treaties were like letting the tail wag the dog."

And after the armistice, a national administration that believed as the present one does, that Uncle Sam could not go broke, dished out the money and helped to rehabilitate Europe. And when it came to repayment, well, the tail wagged the dog again."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 721. (Inserted by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas.)

Ludlow, Louis, Representative from Indiana: "When we attempt to realize the enormous money cost of war, the human mind fails to function. When the Treasury Department informs us by official records that the direct cost of the World War up to June 30, 1934, the date of the last revision, was \$41,765,000,000, to say nothing of the much greater collateral costs, including losses on foreign loans, the reaction to the information is almost negligible. * * * If we could comprehend what this means to the American taxpayers, if we could realize the sweat and toil, the body aches and mental worries required to produce even a billion dollars, we would have a better conception of the financial burden that war places on the backs of our long-suffering people."

Source: Ludlow, Louis, *Hell or Heaven*, Boston, 1935. Page 58.

McCabe, Louis F., chairman, Lawyers Committee to Keep the United States Out of War.—A brief: "The short depression of 1921, which was followed by the cataclysmic dislocation of our economic life in 1929, finally culminated in a belief that our policy of foreign loans and credits had been a ghastly mistake. Not only had we failed to make the world safe for democracy, we had betrayed ourselves. Debt repudiation was followed by the outspoken animosity of nations with whom we had been formerly allied."

Source: Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1016. (Inserted by Senator B. K. WHEELER, of Montana.)

Norris, George W., Senator from Nebraska: "When we entered the World War we made the greatest mistake in the history of our

Nation. We put the dollar sign on the American flag and went into the war."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington 1939. Appendix, page 129. (Inserted by Senator J. F. BYRNES, of South Carolina.)

OLIVER, JAMES C., Representative from Maine: In 1917 we ventured forth once again to beat up the Kaiser, preserve democracy, and stop war for all time. Once again we won all the battles but we lost 126,000 Americans, we maimed some 234,000 other Americans, and we lost at least \$41,000,000,000 directly with an indirect and cumulative loss of more than \$100,000,000,000. But today our hospitals are filled with mentally deranged, blind and maimed men who were the pawns in that foreign embroilment of ours. What of the democracy we were to perpetuate? What of the madness of war which we were to end? You know the answers."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939, Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 258.

OVERTON, JOHN H., Senator from Louisiana: "We came out of that war without having saved the world for democracy, without putting an end to all wars, without attaining any of the high ideals for which our soldiers fought and died in foreign lands."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 408. (Inserted by Senator L. B. SCHWELLENBACH, of Washington.)

Pershing, John J., wartime commander of the American Expeditionary Forces, at Montfaucon, France, August 1, 1937: "The last conflict brought no profit to anyone, but left many questions still unsettled. But they cannot be settled by war. Yet the prospects for peace do not look promising. Hatred and suspicion still exist and armaments at enormous cost continue to grow."

Source: *What They Said in 1937*, New York, 1938, page 221.

Pittman, Key, late Senator from Nevada: "The people of this country fully realize the futility and tragedy of our entrance into the World War. They lost the lives of many of their sons. Others came back to them broken in body and mind, maimed, blinded, deranged, too frequently, to spend the rest of their hopeless lives in hospitals and insane asylums. And where was the financial profit? The money we spent will never be recovered. The money that our Government lent to the Entente Powers with which to purchase our products will never be returned, and all of the false profits that our people thought they were making will be taxed out of them, and more for years will be taxed out of them, for the little comfort and protection that we can give to our heroic disabled soldiers."

Source: Academy of Political Science, New York, *Proceedings*, volume XVII, No. 3 (May 1937), pages 50-51.

Railway Labor Executives' Board, statement of:

" * * * While American soldiers fought in the trenches to decide a European war whose issues were of no real concern to us, billions of dollars were being paid by our Government directly and through the financial agents of foreign governments to the manufacturers of munitions in the United States. The appalling sacrifices demanded of our soldiers and their families should have brought voluntary surrendering by our munitions manufacturers of all profit; they should have been eager to supply to us and our Allies all possible munitions at actual cost. We know now that to the eternal disgrace of these interests they reaped profits which were far beyond any possible justification, which were possible only because of the

desperate needs of the Government and the people of the United States."

Source: Ludlow, Louis, *Hell or Heaven*, Boston, p. 155, 1935.

Rickenbacker, Capt. Eddie, *American World War ace*: "The close of the World War and subsequent events during these past 22 years have brought about the disillusionment and realization that the winner and the loser of such a conflict must suffer the consequences alike."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 117. (Inserted by Hon. J. C. Schafer, of Wisconsin.)

Rightmire, Dr. George W., president emeritus of Ohio State University: "The United States came out of the great World War without an additional foot of territory, after having advanced billions of dollars worth of equipment and supplies, and having extended credits for other billions—practically all of which remains today an unpaid and ignored debt, owed to us by many European countries. We refused our signature to the Treaty of Versailles, and we declined membership in the League of Nations and in the Permanent Court of International Justice, both of which were created by the treaty. We came out of Europe at the end of the war with a reverberating shout of relief and a Nation-wide chorus of 'never again.'"

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 102. (Inserted by Congressman J. M. Vooris, of Ohio.)

Roosevelt, Col. Theodore: "Theoretically, we won the war. The condition of the world is a bitter commentary on the value of our victory. Not only did we gain nothing for the world, but we hurt ourselves and damaged our own democracy."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 567. (Inserted by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas.)

Root, Elihu, former Cabinet member, in speech, *The Restoration Policies of the United States*, February 19, 1920: "One result of the war and of the universal unrest which has followed it has been to force upon the American democracy a series of questions which involve the very life of the Nation. These questions arise from widely different causes, and each presents its own special problems: Bolshevism, Americanization of immigrants, the deportation or discipline of seditious aliens, the relations of organized labor to the public, the coal supply, the railroads, the preservation of public health, the security for the life of the community, and opportunity for the pursuit of happiness by its members."

Source: Root, Elihu, *Men and Policies*, Cambridge, Mass., 1924, pages 222-223.

Schwellenbach, Lewis B., former Senator from Washington: "We know the utter futility of getting into another European war. We tried it once, thinking we could help solve Europe's problems. It took them a short 20 years to get back at each other's throats again. We don't intend to sacrifice the lives, the bodies, and the minds of our young men nor the resources of our country making that same mistake again."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 410.

SHIPSTEAD, HENRIK, United States Senator from Minnesota: "In other words, we should save democracy by war. We tried to do that 20 years ago, and what happened to democracy? Instead of saving democracy, we succeeded in establishing communism in Russia, fascism in Italy, and nazi-ism in Germany. We did it because the war and the

treaties following the war created so much bankruptcy, unemployment, and hunger that the populations, in their suffering, were forced to accept any form of government that promised them bread."

Source: Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1078.

Stimson, Edward W., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Sioux City, Iowa: "We have plenty of experience to draw upon still fresh from 20 years ago. We lost 130,000 lives in action, many more from secondary causes, and got nothing for it, not even thanks in the end, but only criticism for not joining in sooner. The billions of dollars it cost us will never be repaid. We ruined our western plains, foolishly plowing them up to furnish war-boom wheat, and now have the Dust Bowl to remind us of our folly. The prosperity we temporarily enjoyed was mainly for a few profiteers, while in the end our national losses were permanent. We had loaned billions to feed the armies of Europe and make possible the profits from war trade, and since we could not collect the loans we really gave it all away."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939. Washington, 1939. Appendix, page 97 (inserted by Representative V. F. HARRINGTON, of Iowa).

TAPT, ROBERT A., United States Senator from Ohio: "The World War was fought to make the world safe for democracy. It resulted in more dictatorships than the world had seen for 100 years. England today is necessarily almost a socialist state. The best opinion is that it will continue to be so after the war. In the meantime in this country we vastly increase Government activity. We put the Government into every business. We pile up a national debt so great that repudiation stares us in the face * * *"

Source: Wall Street Journal, February 12, 1941, page 4, column 7.

Thomas, Norman, prominent Socialist: "We tried the madman's way of helping last time, and we added to the ruin. A peace of exhaustion, or a peace of fraternization, would have been far better than the peace of Versailles."

Source: Thomas, Norman, and Wolfe, B. D.: *Keeping America Out of War*. New York, 1939, page 50.

Van Antwerp, Eugene I., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (1939): "We know about the futility of war, the disheartening human aftermath of war, the disillusionment upon finding our promised old jobs filled by others, and upon noting the economic maladjustments visited upon ourselves and upon the entire country by reason of its participation in war."

Source: United States Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Hearings. American Neutrality Policy. Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. Washington, 1939, page 159.

VAN ZANDT, JAMES E., Congressman from Pennsylvania, former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "So shocking was the mass murder, the misery, the waste of money, and the destruction of the World War, that all peace-loving men vowed it would be the war to end all war. * * * Instead of peace, we have witnessed a re-divided world, already badly divided."

Source: United States Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Hearings. American Neutrality Policy. Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. Washington, 1939, page 62.

VANDENBERG, ARTHUR H., Senator from Michigan. Address at Gettysburg, Pa., May 30, 1938: "Far from being 'a world made safe for democracy,' as we thought was our lofty objective in our last Great War, it is a world in which democracy under many a flag lies wounded to death."

Source: Baird, A. Craig. *Representative American Speeches: 1937-38*, New York, 1938, page 40.

VANDENBERG, ARTHUR H., Senator from Michigan: "The last war cost us 40,000 American boys killed in action. Their crosses dot the skyline of futility. This present one, says Colonel Lindbergh, would cost us a million boys. The last war cost us 192,000 wounded, 76,000 who died of disease, and 350,000 more who now deserve and receive disability allowances. The next war, if Lindbergh is remotely right, would infinitely multiply this sacrifice. The last war cost us at least 40 billions in money, including 14 billions which our erstwhile Allies still owe us 25 years later, all debtors except Finland having suspended all pretense of liquidation. This war appears to relegate the collection of these debts—without adding any more to them—to the ledgers of the millennium. We did not even know for what we fought. Before we ever fired a shot the spoils of our joint victory had been pre-pledged in sordid, secret treaties concerning which neither our people nor even our Congress knew a single thing. It was a shell game in more than one meaning of that phrase. Let us remember that, my countrymen."

Source: French, Paul Comly edition, *Common Sense Neutrality*, New York, 1939, pages 230-231.

Villard, Oswald G., editor and publicist: "Never did it occur to me in 1917 that within 20 years the bulk of our countrymen would agree with us who declared that we could not win the war and that our entry into it was the greatest blunder in American history."

Source: Villard, Oswald Garrison, *Fighting Years*, New York, 1939, page 520.

VOORHIS, JERRY, Congressman from California: "Twenty-one short years ago that war ended and America woke up, too late, to find that she had fought a war which did not end war or save democracy or even create a lasting peace but which ended in a treaty that was to sow the seeds of another war and of new dictatorships."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939, Washington, 1939, Appendix, page 122.

WALSH, DAVID I., Senator from Massachusetts, Labor Day address: "Instead of being saved for posterity—the asserted objective of the World War—democracy has been destroyed and crushed in many great nations."

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 85, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, November 1-3, 1939, Washington, 1939, Appendix, page 484.

Weir, Ernest T., chairman, 1939, National Steel Corporation: "We went into the last war because we thought it was a 'war to end war' and a war 'to make the world safe for democracy.' We paid a terrible price in the slaughter and maiming of thousands of our youth and in the prodigious waste of our resources. We are still paying for that war. Obviously, we did not end war, and obviously we did not save democracy."

Source: French, Paul Comly, *Common Sense Neutrality*, New York, 1939, page 249.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is whether we favor a policy which contemplates such a fundamental and material change in our relation to the war in Europe that it would tend to our all-out entry into the war and the service and sacrifice of our boys wherever they may be sent. Most of us have made very solemn pledges to our people on

that issue. Many of us see no reason to change.

We still rely on the pledges of the two great parties and their national platforms and the assurances given the American people by the candidates of those parties. Nothing has happened, in our opinion, that should not have been foreseen when those pledges were made and those assurances given.

The decision which we must make is based primarily on our regard for those pledges. I confess that I may be a bit old fashioned in my understanding and regard for the pledged word. Others may feel otherwise. After all, they, as other men, must live with their own consciences. As I see it—and remember I am not sitting in judgment on others—those of us who have made pledges and who are old fashioned enough to regard those pledges have one of two courses open to us. We can abandon the commitments which we have made directly or indirectly and upon which our people depended—we can stand convicted of infidelity before the bar of public opinion in our districts—we can elect to tear down the faith and confidence of our people in their form of government—yes; we can take that course.

Or, we can cling to the course upon which the traditions of America are founded, the course which has been ennobled by the records of men who in times past have had the courage of their convictions—the course upon which every sacred tie is founded, the ties of family, of home, of fireside—the course of fidelity and faithfulness. I would not attempt to urge others in the decision which must be made; every man must live with himself, but, as for myself, I have but one course to follow, one choice to make: I must fulfill my pledge to the people whom I have the honor to represent and who look to me to be true to the commitments which I have made to them.

Future historians analyzing without prejudice or passion the course of American foreign policy between the evacuation of Dunkirk and the present momentous decision regarding the Neutrality Act, will undoubtedly take cognizance of the declarations of the candidates of the two major parties during the 1940 Presidential campaign. I have scanned the records and submit to the House at this time quotations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell L. Willkie, which I believe are pertinent and significant, and which I believe should be a part of the permanent record of this body on this day when a far-reaching decision will be made:

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The American people are determined that wars raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America. We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been and will continue to be the defense of our land and the maintenance of its peace. (From the Democratic platform, adopted in Chicago, July 1940.)

2. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars. * * * At the beginning of September the storm broke and on the 21st of that month, in a message to Congress, I said that this Government must lose no time or effort to keep this Nation from being drawn into the war, and I asserted my belief that we would succeed in these efforts. We have succeeded. I believe we shall continue to succeed. (President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress, July 10, 1940.)

3. This is not inconsistent in any sense with our status of peace. Still less is it a threat against any nation. (President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress on the destroyer transfer to Britain, September 3, 1940.)

4. I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war from these shores for all time. I stand with my party upon the platform adopted at Chicago: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack. (President Roosevelt, before the convention of the Teamsters Union, September 11, 1940.)

5. To every man, woman, and child I say your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves, not for any purpose of conflict or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party; we will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life. (President Roosevelt, at Philadelphia, October 23, 1940.)

6. In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless, dishonest fake. (President Roosevelt at the New York Herald Tribune Forum, October 24, 1940.)

7. By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right?

We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call upon American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent, and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all these ways we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders. These were measures to keep us at peace. And through the years of war there has been no entanglement and there will be no entanglement. We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace. (President Roosevelt at Madison Square Garden, October 28, 1940.)

8. And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes; the purpose of our defense is defense. (President Roosevelt at Boston, October 30, 1940.)

9. I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States. (President Roosevelt at Brooklyn, November 1, 1940.)

10. We look at the Old World of Europe today. It is an ugly world, poisoned by hatred, and greed, and fear. We can see what has been the inevitable consequence of that poison—it has been war.

And we look at the country in which we live. It is a great country, built by generations of peaceable, friendly men and women who had in their hearts faith—faith that the good life can be obtained by those who will work for it.

We know that we are determined to defend our country and with our neighbors to defend this hemisphere. We are strong in our defense.

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. (President Roosevelt at Cleveland, November 2, 1940.)

11. There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nall any talk about sending armies to Europe as a deliberate untruth.

Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and away from our people. (President Roosevelt in fireside chat, December 29, 1940.)

12. He (the President) indicated that he has not now and has never had any idea of sending the Navy or the marines to fight abroad in the present war.

Mr. Early had made about the same reply to the same question earlier in the day. The question was whether any comment was forthcoming on apprehensions expressed in some newspapers and by some Members of Congress that the President's statement in his fireside chat did not specifically exclude the Navy and the Marine Corps. The reference was to the following paragraph:

"There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such force."

Mr. Early said that anyone drawing such inferences was not confused but confusing. The President merely replied that he constantly sees in the newspapers and hears from Members of Congress things that he has never thought in his life and interpretations he has never imagined. (Press conference on December 31, 1940, as reported in the New York Times of January 1, 1941.)

13. We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the two great parties in respect to that national policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate. And today it is abundantly evident that American citizens everywhere are demanding and supporting speedy and complete action in recognition of obvious dangers. * * *

Let us say to the democracies: "We shall send you in ever-increasing numbers ships, planes, tanks, guns. That is our purpose and our pledge." * * *

Such aid is not an act of war. (President Roosevelt on state of the Nation, January 6, 1941.)

14. President Roosevelt said at his press conference today that he had never considered using American naval vessels to convoy

ships bearing supplies to Great Britain. Sources close to the White House indicated the official view to be that such convoying might lead to war.

Sources close to the White House said it was obvious that if the United States Navy convoyed ships, either under the American or another flag, into a combat zone shooting was pretty sure to result and shooting came "awfully close to war." Those responsible for foreign policy wanted to avoid that and the last thing they wanted was to compel the shooting to start.

A reporter remarked at the press conference that one suggestion had been that the Navy convoy ships into British waters and another that they convoy them to Iceland, where the British Navy would take them over. The President replied that the latter suggestion was a new one to him and asked what about the Falkland Islands, the Celebes, or the Andamans.

The President again described as cow-jump-over-the-moon, Old Mother Hubbard stuff assertions that he would transfer American naval ships to Britain or any foreign power. He also reiterated that he had no intention of standing on his head. (Press conference of January 21, 1941, as reported in the New York Times of January 22, 1941.)

15. President Roosevelt has assured the National League of Women Voters in a letter to its president, Miss Marguerite M. Wells, that the policy he contemplates under the lease-lend bill will not be a war policy, "but the contrary."

"In acknowledging my appreciation of the league's position, I am glad to reiterate the assurance, that the policy under which the measure would be operated would not be a war policy, but the contrary." (New York Times of March 6, 1941.)

16. And from now on the aid will be increased and yet again increased until full victory has been won. Never in all history have Americans faced a job so well worthwhile. (President Roosevelt in a radio address, March 15, 1941.)

17. The United States has taken Greenland under its protection and will insure its remaining a Danish colony, President Roosevelt announced today.

Despite denials by some officials, it was stated on good authority that a party of American Army, Navy and diplomatic agents went to Greenland on Coast Guard cutters recently to investigate establishment of bases. It was ascertained, however, that no American forces have yet been dispatched there and officials insisted that no plans for sending them had been drafted. (New York Times, April 11, 1941.)

18. When asked specifically about convoys, President Roosevelt said that more printers' ink had been used on this subject by people who knew nothing about it than on any other matter in his memory. The President went on to say that he knew a little about the subject but that he would not care to discuss it. He dismissed as merely the talk of orators, the reports that American merchant ships might be armed. (Press conference on April 15, 1941, as reported in the New York Times of April 16, 1941.)

19. Referring to a newspaper report that American ships actually were escorting convoys for the British within the neutrality zone, Mr. Early said: "The President of the United States, after reading a morning paper, said he thought the author of the story had very cleverly woven a long-time and historic policy of the United States into a story which was a deliberate lie." (New York Times of April 18, 1941.)

20. He (President Roosevelt) declared that the war could be won by assuring the existence of England which he called the defender of democracy. * * * In such a low voice

that he could scarcely be heard he added, "and the British Empire. * * *

A reporter asked the President if he was confident that Britain could hold out. The President said he was.

Asked if American convoys were being considered, the President gave an indirect reply, remarking, laughingly, that he had never been to Delphi. (Press conference of April 23, 1941, as reported in the New York Times of April 24, 1941.)

22. The President stated that while he agreed with Secretary Hull that ways must be found to get quick, full aid to Britain and with Secretary Knox that "this is our fight," the Government was not considering naval convoys at this time.

Nevertheless the Government was extending the neutrality patrol out in the Atlantic and wherever necessary, he explained, into all of the seven seas. This was for the purpose of providing an information service so that ships could avoid trouble and for hemisphere defense.

On convoys the President expressed the following views: Secretary Hull and Secretary Knox spoke for a great many American people and for the President, as well as for themselves, when they said in speeches yesterday that ways must be quickly found to send the fullest possible aid to nations bearing the brunt of the Axis attack and that the American people have irrevocably committed themselves to see that a victory of the aggressor nations shall be prevented. * * *

This was a patrol, however, and not a convoy. A convoy meant escorting merchant ships traveling in a group and protecting the ships from attack by fighting off an assailant. A patrol is a reconnaissance in certain areas to detect any aggressor ships which might be coming to the Western Hemisphere. It was indicated that ships could avoid areas reported to be dangerous. The patrol would report the presence of any aggressor to the President, and he would decide what to do.

There is the same difference between the two operations (patrolling and convoying) as between a cow and a horse. If one looks at a cow and calls it a horse that is all right with the President, but that does not make the cow a horse. The President does not think they are the same. (Press conference of April 25, 1941, as reported in the New York Times of April 26, 1941.)

22. What started as a European war has developed, as the Nazis always intended it should develop, into a World War for world domination. Adolf Hitler never considered the domination of Europe as an end in itself. European conquest was but a step toward ultimate goals in all the other continents. * * * They plan to treat the Latin American nations as they are now treating the Balkans. They plan then to strangle the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada. * * * The Axis Powers can never achieve their objective of world domination unless they first obtain control of the seas. * * * But if the Axis Powers fail to gain control of the seas, they are certainly defeated. Their dreams of world domination will then go by the board, and the criminal leaders who started this war will suffer inevitable disaster. * * *

Once they are limited to a continuing land war their cruel forces of occupation will be unable to keep their heel on the necks of the millions of innocent, oppressed people on the continent of Europe, and in the end their whole structure will break into little pieces. And the wider the Nazi land effort the greater the danger. * * *

I have said on many occasions that the United States is mustering its men and its resources only for purpose of defense—only to repel attack. I repeat that statement now. But we must be realistic when we use the word "attack"—and we have to relate it to the lightning speed of modern warfare. * * * Our patrols are helping now

to insure delivery of the needed supplies to Britain. All additional measures necessary to delivery of the goods will be taken. The delivery of needed supplies to Britain is imperative. This can be done; it must be done; it will be done. (President Roosevelt's address on May 27, 1941.)

23. We must take the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. (President Roosevelt, as quoted in the New York Times of June 21, 1941.)

24. President Roosevelt reiterated today his earlier expression of hope that the United States could keep out of war but he refrained from expressing confidence that this country would be able to avoid fighting. * * *

A reporter asked: "Mr. President, back when war first started it was a proper question to ask you if you thought we could keep out of war. You always said that we could."

The President answered that he had not said so. He had stated that he hoped we could. (Press conference as reported in the New York Times of July 1, 1941.)

25. The President made something of a joke of attempts to define the Western Hemisphere rigidly. It all depended, he said, upon what geographer one talked to last. When someone recalled that the President himself had marked the area on a previous occasion, and that his line then left most, if not all, of Iceland in the Eastern Hemisphere, the President remarked, with a chuckle, that it all depended on what geographer one talked to last. (Press conference after the occupation of Iceland, as reported in the New York Times of July 9, 1941.)

26. The international situation is not less grave but more grave than it was a year ago. * * * I do not believe that the danger to American safety is less than it was 1 year ago, when, so far as the Army was concerned, the United States was in a woefully weak position. I do not believe that the danger to our national safety is only about the same as it was a year ago. I do believe—I know—that the danger today is infinitely greater. I do believe—I know—that in all truth we are in the midst of a national emergency. (President Roosevelt on the necessity for extension of the draft, on July 21, 1941.)

27. The Executive made clear that he believed the attack on the American vessel (the *Greer*) was deliberate, and that he considered it no less serious because the destroyer had evaded destruction and answered with depth charges. The attempt to sink the *Greer* took place in daylight when visibility was good, the President declared, and more than one attack was made by the submarine. (Press conference of September 5, 1941, as reported in the New York Times of September 6, 1941.)

28. My dear fellow Americans, the Navy Department of the United States has reported to me that on the morning of September 4 the United States destroyer *Greer*, proceeding in full daylight toward Iceland, had reached a point southeast of Greenland. She was carrying mail to Iceland. She was flying the American flag. Her identity as an American ship was unmistakable.

She was then and there attacked by a submarine. Germany admits that it was a German submarine. The submarine deliberately fired a torpedo at the *Greer*, followed later by another torpedo attack. In spite of what Hitler's propaganda bureau has invented, and in spite of what any American obstructionist organization may prefer to believe, I tell you the blunt fact that the German submarine fired first upon this American destroyer, without warning and with deliberate design to sink her. (President Roosevelt's address on September 11, 1941.)

On September 4, 1941, the U. S. S. *Greer*, while en route to Iceland with United States mail and passengers and some freight, was

informed by a British plane of the presence of a submerged submarine, distance about 10 miles directly ahead. This British plane continued in the vicinity of the submarine until 1052, when she departed. Prior to her departure, at 1032, she dropped four depth charges in the vicinity of the submarine.

Acting on the information from the British plane, the *Greer* proceeded to search for the submarine, and at 0920 she located the submarine directly ahead by her underwater sound equipment. The *Greer* proceeded then to trail the submarine and broadcasted the submarine's position. This action taken by the *Greer* was in accordance with her orders, that is, to give out information but not to attack.

The *Greer* maintained this contact until about 1248. During this period (3 hours 28 minutes) the *Greer* maneuvered so as to keep the submarine ahead.

At 1240 the submarine changed course and closed the *Greer*. (Statement of Admiral H. R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, on September 20, 1941.)

Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, told them (Senate Foreign Relations Committee) that the U. S. destroyer *Kearny* was on convoy duty when it was torpedoed in Icelandic waters by a German submarine. (As reported in the New York Times of October 21, 1941.)

31. Another destroyer was attacked and hit on October 17. Eleven brave and loyal men of our Navy were killed by the Nazis.

We have wished to avoid shooting. But the shooting has started. And history has recorded who fired the first shot. * * *

America has been attacked. * * * Hitler's torpedo was directed at every American. (President Roosevelt's Navy Day address on October 27, 1941.)

32. Every school child knows what our foreign policy is. * * * The real end, the inescapable end * * * is the destruction of the Hitler menace. In achieving that end our responsibility is fully as great as that of peoples who are fighting and dying for it. I know our country will not shrink from the responsibility nor quail before whatever sacrifices it may demand. (President Roosevelt's message to the Foreign Policy Association, October 25, 1941.)

WENDELL L. WILLKIE

33. I want to repeat that I have said on several previous occasions that, despite our wholehearted sympathy for the allied cause, we must stay out of the war. In the stress of these times, when our hearts are confused with emotion, we must keep our heads clear. We do not intend to send men from the shores of this continent to fight in any war. That is not mere selfishness on our part; we shall not serve the cause of democracy and human freedom by becoming involved in the present war; we shall serve that cause only by keeping out of war.

I believe in national defense, not as a step toward war but as a protection against it. It is the duty of the President of the United States to recognize the determination of the people to stay out of war and to do nothing by word or deed that will undermine that determination.

No man has the right to use the great powers of the Presidency to lead the people indirectly into war; only the people, through their elected representatives, can make that awful decision, and there is no question as to their decision. (Wendell L. Willkie before the Brooklyn Republican Club on June 18, 1940.)

34. The President of the United States recently said, "We will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation, and at the same time we will harness the use of our resources in order that we ourselves in America may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense."

I should like to state that I am in agreement with these two principles, as I under-

stand them—and I don't understand them as implying military involvement in the present hostilities. * * *

But I cannot follow the President in his conduct of foreign affairs in this critical time. There have been occasions when many of us have wondered if he is deliberately inciting us to war. * * * I know what war can do to demoralize civil liberties at home, and I believe it is the first duty of a President to try and maintain peace.

But Mr. Roosevelt has not done this. He has dabbled in inflammatory statements and manufactured panics. Of course, we in America like to speak our minds freely, but this does not mean at a critical period in history our President should cause bitterness and confusion for the sake of a little political oratory. The President's attacks on foreign powers have been useless and dangerous. He has courted a war for which this country is hopelessly unprepared and which it emphatically does not want. He has secretly meddled in the affairs of Europe and has unscrupulously encouraged other countries to hope for more help than we can give. (Wendell L. Willkie's acceptance speech at Elwood, Ind., on August 17, 1940.)

35. If you elect me President, I will never send an American boy to fight in any European war. (Wendell L. Willkie in Chicago, September 13, 1940.)

36. I hope and pray that he (the President) remembers the pledge of the 1940 platform better than he did the one of 1932. If he does not, you better get ready to get on the transports.

Now let me say to you as a candidate for President of the United States in the year of 1940 that if you elect me President of the United States no American boy will ever be sent to the shambles of any European trench. (Wendell L. Willkie at Los Angeles, September 19, 1940.)

37. The American people do not want war. They have no idea whatever of joining in any conflict, whether on the Atlantic or the Pacific. They are determined to keep America at peace.

In this determination I stand with them. I am for keeping out of war. I am for peace for America. * * * We must not rashly move. Any man who involves us in the risk of war, while we are thus unprepared, betrays his country. (Wendell L. Willkie, at Cleveland on October 2, 1940.)

38. If I am elected President of the United States I shall never lead this country into any European war. As a matter of fact, I shall never lead the country into any kind of a war unless the people, through their representatives in Congress, insist upon it, and I shall also refrain from indulging in extravagant attacks upon other nations. (Wendell L. Willkie, in radio address on October 4, 1940.)

39. We can have peace, but we must begin to preserve it. To begin with we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's wars. Our boys shall stay out of Europe. * * * None of us is so simple as to think that Hitler is planning this moment to send an expeditionary force across the Atlantic. * * * He is aware that if we make democracy strong here his own system of blood and tyranny cannot survive forever. (Wendell L. Willkie, at Cambridge, Mass., on October 11, 1940.)

40. My reason for favoring this sacrifice was not that you should go to war against those dictators. I do not contemplate for you a task so cruel as that. We must avoid it if we can. (Wendell L. Willkie's message to men in the draft, October 15, 1940.)

41. I favor aid to Britain short of war * * * and I mean short of war. (Wendell L. Willkie, at Buffalo, N. Y., October 15, 1940.)

42. Those oceans are indeed broad. We can say with the utmost confidence, standing here in the center of America: "We do not want to send our boys over there again. And if you elect me President, we won't."

But by the same token I believe if you elect the third-term candidate they will be sent. We cannot and we must not undertake to maintain by arms the peace of Europe. * * *

The role of the United States is not the settlement of boundary disputes or of racial disputes. It is not the maintenance of a balance of power in Europe. (Wendell L. Willkie at St. Louis on October 17, 1940.)

43. One difference (between my foreign policy and that of the New Deal) is my determination to stay out of war. I have a real fear that this administration is heading for war and will do all I can to avoid it. (Wendell L. Willkie at Chicago on October 22, 1940.)

44. He said that he was working for peace. He said that he would stand by the Democratic platform of 1940, and he quoted the pledge on that platform:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

I hope, I hope, oh, so sincerely that that pledge by the third-term candidate based upon the 1940 platform of the Democratic Party is remembered by him longer than he remembered the honor of the credit of the United States, which was based upon the Democratic platform of 1932.

I sincerely hope that on some future occasion the third-term candidate will not tell reporters that as of that day he made the pledge he had no intention of going to war. (Wendell L. Willkie at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on October 25, 1940.)

45. I want to place beyond Britain the industrial organization of a revitalized and fully operating America. I do not and will not send troops. (Wendell L. Willkie at Charleston, W. Va., on October 29, 1940.)

46. In protecting America, the maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere will be my objective. * * *

The interests of the United States would have been better served if the third-term candidate had been outspokenly for peace and nonparticipation (earlier) instead of waiting to pledge it at an election. (Wendell L. Willkie at Cumberland, Md., on October 30, 1940.)

47. I have given you my pledge many times over. I will work for peace. We are against sending our boys into any war other than the defense of our country. * * *

On the basis of his past performance with pledges to the people, you may expect to be at war by April 1941 if he is elected. * * *

Even as late as June 10, 1940, he startled the world. He declared of Italy that the hand that held the dagger "has struck it into the back of its neighbor." In the capitals of Europe this bit of oratory was not taken as a move to keep the United States at peace. * * *

Here, then, are three basic elements in the protection of America—good faith in the pursuit of peace in this hemisphere, a wise and consistent diplomacy, and a strong military and naval defense force. (Wendell L. Willkie at Baltimore, Md., October 30, 1940.)

48. I happen to know about war at first hand and I hate war. I saw the damage done by a war—at home and abroad—the loss of security and the extinction of civil liberties even in this land of the free.

I have not forgotten that lesson. My every act as President will be to keep this country out of foreign wars and keep it at peace. I promise, as I have promised many times before, not to send your husbands and sons and brothers to death on a European or Asiatic battlefield.

I will avoid bringing about a condition of affairs that will make war necessary. And I will never take this country into war until your representatives declare it. (Wendell L. Willkie in an address to the women of the United States from New York City on November 4, 1940.)

49. Mr. Roosevelt and I both promised the people in the course of the campaign that if

we were elected we would keep this country out of war unless attacked. Mr. Roosevelt was reelected and this solemn pledge for him I know will be fulfilled, and I know the American people desire him to keep it sacred. (Wendell L. Willkie in a broadcast to the American people on November 12, 1940.)

50. I have examined this bill (lend-lease) in the light of the current emergency, and I personally have come to the conclusion that, with modifications, it should be passed.

This is a critical moment in history. The United States is not a belligerent and we hope we shall not be. Our problem, however, is not alone to keep America out of war but to keep war out of America. (Wendell L. Willkie's statement on the lease-lend bill as reported in the New York Times of January 13, 1941.)

51. We shall not keep America out of war by mere strong statements that she is to stay out of war. We will keep America out of war if we supply to the fighting men of Britain sufficient resources so they may crush and defeat the ruthless dictatorship of Hitler. (Wendell L. Willkie at Town Hall forum in New York City on January 16, 1941.)

52. We will, however, stay out of the war, in my judgment, if the men of Britain are supported to the utmost and immediately. This can only be done by the granting of enlarged powers to the President to deal not alone with the international situation but with the building of the materials and instruments of combat. (Wendell L. Willkie, before the Women's National Republican Club, on January 18, 1941.)

53. Mr. Willkie still maintained that the policy of aid to Britain should contain the qualification of "short of war," or, as he explained it, "short of those actions which we know in advance will lead inevitably to military involvement." (New York Times of January 20, 1941.)

54. What the British desire from us is not men but materials and equipment. * * * As a matter of fact, in my judgment, if we do give aid to Britain, we are likely to stay out of war; while if we do not give aid to Britain, we shall probably become involved in war. (Wendell L. Willkie, as interviewed on his arrival from England, in the New York Times of February 10, 1941.)

55. Testimony of Wendell L. Willkie before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 11, 1941:

"Question. I am merely trying to determine whether this all-out aid to England does finally include our entry into the war.

"Answer. Our declaration of war? I would say, "No."

"Question. Do you think that the passage of this bill will take us further away from war or closer to war?

"Answer. Much further away from war. I cannot imagine anything interfering with Britain's successfully prevailing in this war more than if we declared war and tried to send troops to Europe. If America gives that effective aid, then America will have the power to determine whether the captured democracies of Europe will survive.

"Question. What do you mean by effective aid?

"Answer. I have outlined three things. Effective aid, in my judgment, consists in giving Britain immediately destroyers; second, giving her all the P. B. Y.'s and bombers that we possibly can; giving her the bombers that we can; and then gearing our own productive capacity to ultimately give to her as rapidly as we can, consistent with our own defense, all of the airplanes and other instruments necessary for her prevailing in this struggle.

"I would give all of the effective aid I could to Britain, and I think thereby we will keep out of war.

"Question. I am talking about sending our merchant ships into war zones. It would be necessary to do that in order to get this material to them, would it not, to be effective?

"Answer. I do not believe so, myself.

"Question. How would you suggest that we get it to them?

"Answer. I think they would send their cruisers here and get the goods out and get them over there.

"Question. Mr. Churchill says they have not the shipping available.

"Answer. I still take my position. I cannot speak for Mr. Churchill. That would be highly presumptuous.

"Question. If Mr. Willkie thinks it is necessary to send American shipping over to convoy this material, you are willing to do that?

"Answer. Oh, no; I did not say that.

"Question. You did not?

"Answer. When did I say that? It was just the reverse of that.

"Question. You did use the phrase 'short of war' in the campaign, did you not?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Do you still adhere to that view?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Where do you draw the line short of war?

"Answer. I have tried to make it clear to you that I think effective aid to Britain is almost sure to be short of war.

"Question. Would you consider that convoying our ships would be short of war?

"Answer. I have said to you that in my judgment—and I expressed it to British officials—convoying ships might produce an incident which might be provocative of war if an attack should be made on them.

"Answer. In the course of the campaign I made a great many statements about him (the President). He was my opponent, you know.

"Question. You would not have said anything about your opponent you did not think was true, would you?

"Answer. Oh, no; but occasionally in moments of oratory in campaigns we all expand a little bit.

"Question. Is it your personal opinion that if we pass this bill that it will keep us out of war?

"Answer. Well, I can only say to you that in my judgment that is true."

56. Mr. Lindbergh's assumption that vast expeditionary forces of American boys will be required for the defeat of Hitler is as much out of date as his belief that the leaders and people of Britain are today confused and unprepared. (Wendell L. Willkie in current Colliers as reported in the New York Times of May 2, 1941.)

57. "Within 90 days, within 6 months at the latest, the United States without even the assistance of British production will be turning out more armaments and airplanes than Germany," predicted Wendell L. Willkie at Nashville, Tenn., on May 4, 1941, adding that it was imperative to see that what was built for Britain was delivered to Britain. (New York Times of May 5, 1941.)

58. I said many times before and during the campaign that England must win the war if our democracy is to survive. But 8, 7—even 6 months ago—I hoped, and said, that top-speed production in the United States would be all the help necessary from us to enable her to win.

In those early days Germany was preoccupied on the Continent and Britain was able to carry her own goods. * * * Now it is painfully obvious that production is not enough. The goods we produce must get there if England is to win. * * * It is now our job not only to produce the goods necessary for her survival but to deliver them by whatever means will be most efficient. * * *

And may I say that I hope that the President shortly establishes bases in such places as Iceland in order to protect our interests.

If America insures delivery, we have well-founded assurances that not alone will England survive but England will win. (Wendell L. Willkie at Chicago on June 6, 1941.)

59. I am quite sure that before long now the great force of the American Navy will be

brought to play to insure delivery of those products to the fighting men of Britain. (Wendell L. Willkie on July 4, 1941.)

60. The cause of democracy is much stronger today than it was a year ago. A great percentage of the Italian Navy has been sunk and the rest forced into hiding. The Italian people regret their alliance with Hitler. Not only has Germany failed to achieve air supremacy over England, but England has recently enjoyed air supremacy over western Europe and has had a chance besides to build up her air force. In Russia the German armies have suffered frightful losses in men and equipment. On the Atlantic Ocean fewer ships are being sunk. (Wendell L. Willkie in the Reader's Digest, November 1941.)

As we study these quotations, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the American people had the right to accept the assurances of the candidates and the covenants of their respective parties as solemn and inviolable pledges. I have reread the platform of my own party. I look upon it as a covenant made by the Republican Party with the people. I have endorsed that platform on many occasions, and in opposing the present resolution I believe I am fulfilling those solemn pledges.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that any Member of Congress could regard the pending measure as other than a declaration of war. The bill before us repeals the heart and soul of the Neutrality Act, which was designed and written in calmer days for just such a situation as the one in which we now find ourselves.

For any American to make a distinction between the lives lost at sea and the lives lost on the battlefield would be perverted thinking in the extreme. Through the actions of the President, out to save the world, but with no blue print for doing the job, and through the actions of a Congress, too interested in patronage and politics to act for their country's future, we have been brought to the brink of war.

Pressure groups and propagandists on all sides are confusing and disuniting the American people at a moment when it is their high patriotic duty to calmly think of their country's future.

The American people today are little better off than the German people under the iron heel of Adolf Hitler. Both peoples have had their most important power—the power to make war—taken from them. The Constitution specifically gives the right to declare war to the representatives of the people. On September 11 President Roosevelt issued a personal declaration of war in his order to the Navy of the United States to "shoot on sight." This order was based on statements made by the President which later proved to be falsehoods. A free people must not be tricked, lied, and misled into

war through the back door. The passage of this bill will open the way to a series of bloody encounters and will cost the lives of countless Americans and millions in property.

It is time that the administration told the American people the truth.

It is time that the people were told about the state of our total unpreparedness for total war at this time.

It is time the people were told that a second A. E. F. is being planned in high places.

It is time the people were told that inflation is just around the corner.

It is time the people were told that their standards of living will be reduced to the point of actual hardship.

It is time the people were told about the one hundred and fifty to two hundred billion dollar debt that is coming.

It is time the people were told that the defense program is breaking down because of the President's refusal to delegate proper authority.

It is time the President stopped defending the fourth term and started defending America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the principles in regard to our foreign policy, on which Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt campaigned, are well known. I campaigned on these same principles, namely, preparedness and peace.

I, like they, pledged to the fathers and mothers of this land that their sons would not be sent to die on foreign soil for the purpose of interceding in the age-old quarrels of European or Asiatic countries.

I believe in the words of Wendell L. Willkie of Armistice Day 1 year ago yesterday:

You (the loyal opposition) believe deeply in the principles that we stood for in the last campaign, and principles are not like football suits, to be put on in order to play a game and to be taken off when the game is over.

Mr. Speaker, my people can rest assured that I will keep my promise and stand on the principles I campaigned on so long as it is their sentiment. As Woodrow Wilson once said:

I would rather lose in a cause that I know some day will triumph than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail.

Like Addison, I wonder—

how it is possible for those who are men of honor in their persons thus to become notorious liars in their party.

I offer at this time a telegram received at 2:43 this afternoon from Jeffersonville, Clark County, Ind. This county gave my opponent as great a majority as any two counties in my district and has more defense work than all the other counties combined. So, you see, the conclusion could not possibly be a political one. In other words, the people of that county, like all other Americans, put the welfare of their country ahead of any personal ambitions.

The telegram shows that on a non-partisan poll 61 percent of the people of

Clark County are opposed to sending American ships into the war zones.

I do hope and pray that this provision is not stricken from the Neutrality Act.

Again, paraphrasing the words of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln:

The world will little note or long remember what we say here, but it may never forget what we do here.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

PEACE, PREPAREDNESS, AND AMERICANISM

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the present Neutrality Act prohibits ships flying the American flag from carrying munitions to a belligerent. It also prevents these vessels from entering war zones. American citizens are not permitted to travel on ships belonging to countries at war. American investors who put their money into foreign enterprises could not call on American war ships or American soldiers to protect their interest in foreign countries. These provisions have been successful in keeping our country at peace. If we modify our Neutrality Act and allow our ships to go into the war zones, it will be the final step toward war. I know that if we go into this war we will go in all the way.

So today we are confronted with the question of peace or war. Not war in defense of our own native land but war in Europe, Asia, and Africa; war in which we will weaken our ability to defend ourselves at home. I do not believe that we need the British Navy or the help of the Red Army to defend this Nation or this hemisphere. I do not believe in sacrificing millions of American boys in a struggle across the seas. If we send another American expeditionary force, millions will be killed in action. More of them will be maimed and disabled. Many others will be buried in foreign cemeteries. I believe that our participation in this war is a fatal mistake for our national welfare and our institutions.

Our former Ambassadors to England and France, Messrs. Kennedy and Bullitt, stated before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that we should stay out of this conflict. Mr. Cudahy, former Ambassador to Belgium, urged that we remain at peace. These men speak with first-hand knowledge of foreign affairs. In fact, they are among the few Americans who are in a position to know what has really taken place behind the scenes in Europe.

Before we condemn our own boys to agony and death, let us examine the record of the killed, wounded, and captured:

Britain (2 years).....	134,000
Poland.....	1,675,000
France.....	2,365,000
Russia (3 months).....	2,585,000
Belgium.....	230,000
Yugoslavia.....	225,000
Holland.....	160,000
Greece.....	95,000
Norway.....	5,000

(These figures were obtained from embassies, War Department, and Library of Congress.)

If the President of the United States believes that the safety and welfare of

this Nation demand that the United States should enter this war and be forced to send expeditionary forces abroad, then he should send a message to Congress asking for a declaration of war. That is the only way in which the wishes of our people may be tested. However, if such a message should be sent, and a resolution for a declaration of war should be offered, I will oppose it, because I believe that our entrance into this war is neither necessary nor justifiable. If Congress sees fit to declare war, then we must go in to win if it takes our last man and our last dollar. Once war is declared, they will, no doubt, start mobilizing millions of Americans from the ages of 18 to 45. On the other hand, if Congress should reject a declaration of war, the President should desist from his efforts to edge us into the war.

The American people should know the facts about our national defense. This Nation at present is in no condition to fight a war abroad and will not be for many months to come. The morale of our Army is low, because they have very little equipment. We have very few bombers and large tanks. We do not have enough 90-millimeter antiaircraft guns to protect New York City alone. We have neglected our own defenses in order to help Britain, China, and communistic Russia. Why make the same mistake other countries have made by going off to war while tragically unprepared in terms of modern fighting equipment? I believe it is time we should think once more of ourselves by providing America with a national defense so strong that no dictator or combination of them will seek to attack us. We should also retain the power in the hands of Congress to determine what acts constitute a vital weakening of our national defense or our entry into the war.

I have voted for the appropriations for our own national defense. I voted against the thirteen billion lease-lend "give away" bills to foreign countries, because our national debt is already increasing to the point of bankruptcy. When the American people begin to pay their income taxes next March on the three and one-half billion dollar tax bill they will begin to realize the burden of our own defense without the gift of \$13,000,000,000 to foreign countries. Just how much is \$13,000,000,000? If you stood on a street corner and handed out \$5 bills 1 per minute for 16 hours per day it would take 7,420 years to give away \$13,000,000,000. This amount would pay our Nation's food bill for 1 year. It would pay everybody's clothing bill for 4 years. It would buy 4 years' supply of gas for all of our cars. It would equal 8 years' savings of all Americans. It would pay 4 years' rent of all our homes and offices. We expect a larger tax bill next year. Hidden taxes and income taxes on the poorest classes of our citizens will lower the American standard of living.

The \$13,000,000,000 "give away" bill to foreign countries will cost the taxpayers in Indiana \$342,000,000. It will cost the Seventh District taxpayers over \$28,000,000. It will cost each of our counties the following amounts:

Clay County.....	\$2, 516, 700
Davless County.....	2, 610, 000
Gibson County.....	3, 066, 200
Greene County.....	3, 129, 300
Johnson County.....	2, 244, 800
Knox County.....	4, 386, 500
Martin County.....	1, 027, 800
Monroe County.....	3, 634, 800
Morgan County.....	1, 979, 800
Owen County.....	1, 215, 800
Sullivan County.....	2, 678, 300
Total.....	28, 490, 000

What would the taxpayers in your county say if the county commissioners would bond your county for this amount?

Almost 90 percent of the Republican Members of the House have voted consistently against the preliminary measures leading to war which were urged by the President and voted by his party.

We believe in peace, preparedness, and Americanism. We are determined to keep faith with the American people. We contend that the Republican Party is still the peace party of America. We have voted for appropriations for all-out national defense, and we shall continue to do so. We will have more confidence in the safety and the defense of our country, however, when the President drives the eleven hundred "reds" from the Federal pay rolls. America must wake up. Real Americans must be placed on guard. America has no place for an individual who places any other flag, constitution, way of life, or any other ideals of government above our own.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have had 44 emergencies in the last 9 years. They have been used to cover up the New Deal mistakes. The fact remains that behind the blind of a national emergency the new dealers are attempting to establish a new order here in America by destroying the American system. The American system of free competition and private enterprise is better than anything that has been offered as a substitute. Our system is not perfect, but it is responsive to the demands of progress and to the requirements of the general welfare. It has made mistakes, but it has not failed to correct its methods when the right remedy was found. If we are to continue to have political and religious freedom, assurance to the common man that opportunity is rich and free, that each may go as far and climb as high as his abilities can carry him, we must fortify with hope and purpose the spirit of our people. Whenever all groups in America accept the solemn responsibility of trying to build the economic phases of our democracy, we will begin to make progress. A nation, like a family, cannot exist unless there is mutual respect, confidence, and understanding. In our struggle for justice we should temper our desires with a sense of fairness for other groups. We must stand united for the future and all can benefit if all will serve.

In conclusion, if we allow our ships to enter the war zones, it will mean the final step to war on two fronts. I submit the following reasons against another struggle across the seas:

First. Millions of young Americans would be sacrificed.

Second. America is tragically unprepared in terms of modern fighting equipment.

Third. It will weaken our ability to defend ourselves against invasion.

Fourth. Danger of establishing a new order here in America by destroying the American system.

Fifth. Former Ambassadors to England, France, and Belgium, speaking with first-hand knowledge of foreign affairs, are on record against war.

Sixth. It is our duty to keep our campaign promises to the American people.

Seventh. Danger of national bankruptcy.

Eighth. We should profit by our mistake in entering the World War.

Ninth. Millions of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45 would be mobilized.

Tenth. We have the ability and natural resources to take care of ourselves against any dictator or combination of dictators.

Eleventh. It will permanently close many business establishments in America.

Twelfth. It will deprive labor of its past social and economic gains made during the last quarter of a century.

Thirteenth. It will impair the educational system of America by requiring a greater portion of the tax dollar.

Fourteenth. It will create another vast army of war veterans to pension and to be cared for before we have given justice to the veterans of the last war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is late in the day and perhaps everyone is a little tired, but I want very much to say one or two things. This is a momentous hour, even though our vote on these Senate amendments is not necessarily a final vote on the bill—for we may send it to conference.

I think our very distinguished colleague from South Carolina put it exceedingly well earlier in the day when he called the neutrality measure a noninvolvement act. As such it has been effective. Now it is to be changed. We are asked to make it ineffective. We are to take the brakes off so that we can go to war.

I think you will all bear me out that I have voted to implement those laws which this Congress has passed to help the Allies against Hitler. No one in this House abhors Hitler and his ways more than I. No one in this House desires so passionately to see implemented those people who are in the fight against him. No one here desires more than I do to see this country keep its word to those who are in the front line. We have agreed to be their arsenal. Surely at this moment that is our first duty. If we become part of the actual battle line, we must implement our own men with the matériel with which to fight.

Make no mistake, this war is not like the last war; it is like no other war in history. If we do not keep our word to these other countries, are you so sure we may not be contributing to the downfall of our whole civilization? Dare we jeopardize the future of the world by

going into aggressive war unprepared, unequipped, and untrained, with only a small part of our people anxious to fight?

I beg you, think most carefully before you commit this land of ours, that has been an honorable land, to go into a war to which most of her people are opposed, and to do so secretly under cover of promises of peace. If we must go into this war, let us do so only when we can hold our heads up and our eyes to the front, glorying in our trained strength. Let us not go into it under cover of darkness of deceit. Let us not promise our people peace, telling them, "Oh, no; we won't send our boys," knowing full well that each move we take, one step at a time, is a step toward war. No, Mr. Speaker, I can follow the President a long way, and I have done my best to help him keep his word to Hitler's enemies to furnish them with weapons and to keep his word to our people that we shall not go into war. If the time must come when we must enter the fighting, let it be when all our people unite in the certainty that war, and war only, can save those things which are sacred, that are clean, that are holy. Let us be strong enough to await the moment when we know that the Infinite Source of Light asks us to destroy darkness.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many Members have stood in this Well this afternoon speaking with dogmatic assurance as to what is going to happen. They have told you, as if they had some insight into the future, as if they had some pipe line to all knowledge, that if this bill passes we would have an expeditionary force in Europe in a short time; that it would lead us into war and all manner of evil.

I do not know where those Members get their special knowledge. I have no such special knowledge. I have no positive knowledge as to what will happen if this bill passes or if it does not pass. I am firmly convinced, however, that if this amendment is agreed to and the bill passes we will be in a more favorable position to maintain the peace of this great Republic than if we should reject it. For that reason I am for the amendment as it has come from the other body.

Many of the speeches we have listened to this afternoon have been practically identical. The form has been, first, to apologize; second, to state, "I have voted for everything up until now"; and, third, to say, "Now, if we take this step along the same policy we have been following, this step will be disastrous."

That brings us back to the situation that existed 2 years ago, when I heard on the floor of this House the same arguments from the same lips in almost the same words, telling us that if we made any modification of the then existing bill it would lead us into war immediately. Each and every time this Nation has acted to remove the self-imposed shackles from our own limbs, some voices have risen here to tell us that that step would lead us into war. They have

proven themselves poor prophets, not knowing of what they spoke. They have proven that their prophecies were false. Will you now follow the prophecies of those who have failed in every prophecy so far, or will you follow the leadership of the President who has led us on a course that has kept this Nation free from war? Will you follow the leadership of the State Department, that has kept us out of war, or will you follow the leadership of the minority on the committee, that has told us every time we have sought to do anything constructive that it would lead us into war?

The proposition before this House is not complicated. It is not an involved question. This House passed a bill recently providing for the arming of merchant ships. It went over to another body, and that body passed it and added to it a provision taking from our own limbs the shackles that we ourselves had placed there, simply authorizing those merchant ships to go wherever they might go under international law, just as they could have gone before we ourselves placed those limitations upon our commerce.

This bill does not give any new powers to American shipping. It simply places us back in the position where American shipping and all the shipping of the world has always been before we put voluntary restrictions on ourselves. We put those restrictions there in good faith, believing that we were dealing with civilized nations of the world and expecting to receive civilized treatment in return; but when we found our merchant ships sailing the South Atlantic, thousands of miles from anybody's war zone, torpedoed and sunk without warning, we knew that we are no longer dealing with civilized nations but with international robbers and highwaymen. We knew then that we must deal in a different manner. It therefore became desirable that the United States change the restrictions we heretofore imposed upon ourselves. The whole Neutrality Act was based on the theory that the sheriff and a band of robbers were shooting at each other across the street. The act assumed that even if we had a right to stroll down the street that it would be very foolish for us to do so. That was all very well so long as our safety at home was not threatened. Now it is apparent that the robbers are about to get the best of the officers of the law; that if the robbers kill the sheriff they are strong enough to loot our house and to torture our family. In addition, there is a little yellow sneak thief who has been stealing chickens in the neighborhood, but who has been given a gun by the bandits who are fighting the sheriff. It looks as if the yellow man was only waiting for an opportunity to rob the corpse of any of those fighting with the officers and to break into our back door as soon as the bandits began firing at the front. The officers of the law are about out of ammunition. For my part, I think that it is about time that we lined up with the forces that are trying to put down lawlessness, just like our forefathers did. We better get some shells to the sheriff, even if we do have to risk a stray bullet ourselves, and I do

not think that the risk will be nearly as great as if we turn our backs and run.

There have been those who have stood on this floor and suggested that they wanted to keep the United States out of war, that they did not want our boys slaughtered, trying to impugn the motives of those of us who believe that this is the best way to keep the United States out of war, trying to impugn the motives of those of us who believe that this will more likely save our boys from slaughter, trying to show that we had a desire to lead the United States into a holocaust.

I am impugning no ill motives to any man or woman on this floor. I sincerely believe that those who have spoken spoke from their hearts. I do not mean to suggest that the men who differ with me as to the results of this legislation do so from any evil motive. Neither do I believe they have any right to suggest that my motives are evil. Neither do I believe that they have any right to suggest that I am here advocating the plunging of this Nation into useless slaughter. I am just as sincerely anxious to protect American youth from useless slaughter as any man or woman in this House and I resent the action of those who have tried to place a different interpretation upon the efforts of those of us who believe that this legislation is calculated to protect this country.

I think there can be honest differences of opinion. I think there are honest differences of opinion here this afternoon. I think it all goes back to the proposition as to what course is best calculated and most likely to keep this country out of involvement. Actually the amendment that the Senate put on does not go very far one way or the other. It cannot be proven that it will keep us out of the war if we defeat it. Likewise it cannot be proven that it is going to cause involvement if it is passed. The amendment itself is not a very important measure, but the implications that follow the action that this House takes upon that amendment are very, very far reaching. Fundamentally they are these, and they were very well pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who called your attention to the fact that in most of the foreign lands the people recognize that when their government is overthrown by a vote of lack of confidence that means that the people are not behind the government, and that in those lands this vote will be interpreted as a vote of lack of confidence. So, of course, if we do not pass this amendment, the word will go out tomorrow night in Berlin, in Rome, and in Tokyo that America is no longer interested in seeing that the democracies of this world are successful in their fight against totalitarianism.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Not just yet.

The word will go out tomorrow night, and it will not be day after tomorrow, but it will be tomorrow night. The word will go out to Tokyo that "Japan now has a free hand in the Orient; America is not going to do anything about it; Japan is at liberty to proceed just as fast and as ruthlessly as it wants to." Do you think this is going to maintain peace? Do you think this is going to be conducive to-

ward keeping American boys out of the fighting? I will not question your sincerity if you tell me that you do, but if you tell me this, I will certainly question your judgment.

My judgment tells me that if we encourage Japan on her course of aggression, we are but rapidly leading American boys to useless slaughter. My judgment tells me that if we encourage Japan, Germany, and Italy to believe that we are going to follow the course of appeasement, the same fate will befall us that has befallen every nation that has heretofore followed a course of appeasement. When I was a little boy I learned that if I met a dog that was growling at me and turned my back I was likely to be bitten, and when we are faced with the mad war dogs of Japan and of Nazi Germany, I do not think it is time to turn our backs and to run with our tails between our legs like a whipped cur. I think from the standpoint of saving American lives we had better stand up and give an American account of ourselves in the manner of our heroic ancestors.

Neither can we say this would be without significance upon our own domestic policy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas 1 additional minute.

Mr. POAGE. There are those in this House tonight who are trusting and hoping that the President will adopt a firm policy with respect to the labor situation in this country. We have the opportunity now to establish a strong home front where we may have uninterrupted production of defense material. But to assure this strong home front, the President must have the full support of this Congress. John L. Lewis must be made to know that the people of America will not tolerate any further interference with national defense, and that that national defense is really vital. If we vote this amendment down and say to the world that the leadership of this country does not have the support of the Congress of the United States, or that we do not really believe that the production and delivery of defense material to the foes of Hitler is important, then you may very well expect to see John L. Lewis and not the President of the United States controlling industry in this country throughout the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the name of peace in America, in order to protect American citizens, in order to save our country from the horrors of war, and in order to assure the production and delivery of the material for which we have appropriated billions, let us do the practical thing. Let us vote for a bill that will say to the world that America is behind her leadership; that America is in favor of enforcing American rights all over the world now and at all time to come.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Neutrality Act was originally designed for the purpose of helping our Nation avoid "incidents" that might plunge us headlong into a shooting war.

Generally speaking, section 2 of the Neutrality Act prohibits American vessels from carrying passengers or materials to any state involved in war; and section 3 prohibits American citizens or American vessels from traveling into or through combat areas designated by the President. Section 6 prohibits American vessels engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed. None of these sections affects in any way whatever the movement of the armed forces of our Army or ships of our Navy moving under the direction of the President as their Commander in Chief. The prohibition therein set out applies only to civilians and civilian ships.

The bill, House Joint Resolution 237, in the form it passed the House on October 17, sought to repeal section 6 and thereby authorize the arming of merchant ships. In the form it passed the Senate, November 7, it seeks to repeal section 6, and also sections 2 and 3, thereby removing the restrictions against merchant vessels carrying goods to foreign nations engaged in war, and also removing restrictions against citizens of the United States or any American vessels proceeding into or through designated combat areas. It is worthy of note that no naval or maritime officials urged the arming of our merchant ships, nor did they assure us that the planned arming of our ships would be effective as a defense measure. It strikes me that the placing of inadequate armament on a merchant ship and the sending of that merchant ship with contraband of war directly to belligerent powers is placing a chip on our shoulders inviting attack that will plunge us headlong into a shooting war.

It is worthy of note also that this is the first such measure in a long series wherein the proponents of the legislation have remained strongly silent against the charge that it is a step toward war. This is a war move, and make no mistake about it. This is a war measure, not because it affects the control or movement of the armed forces; it is a war measure because it releases all restrictions against the movement of our merchant ships and our citizens to belligerent nations and in combat zones. It will be impossible to arm the merchant ships sufficiently to make them a match for belligerent warships, and therefore the arming amounts to bait for attack upon our ships, rather than an adequate defense for the attack that will come. It strikes me that this legislation is calculated to do the thing that name calling and insulting speeches have failed to do, and that is precipitating and causing an attack upon us so that we in turn might proclaim to the world that we have cause for joining the shooting war.

Arming of United States merchant vessels will automatically classify such merchant vessels as auxiliary cruisers under international law. Warships of other nations can then sink these ships without any warning whatever, and if some of our merchant ships are armed and others not, we can count on warships of unfriendly foreign powers shooting before they come within close enough range to make a final and accurate determina-

tion as to whether or not that particular merchant ship has a gun on it. Admiral Stark has estimated that it will take 4 months to arm 200 ships, and the rest of our merchant fleet will be thus exposed to attack while still entirely unarmed. Even the merchant ships that are armed will be no match for any warships of a foreign power. We now have approximately 1,200 merchant ships upon the seas under the American flag, and at least 500 of them are in overseas trade. I do not know whether the 200 that Admiral Stark reports can be armed in the next 4 months will take care of our entire trans-Atlantic shipping or not, but it seems to me our merchant ships are in double danger whether in Atlantic or Pacific waters if some of them are known to be armed and can therefore be looked upon as auxiliary cruisers.

I recognize the need for national unity in a full fledged preparedness program, and if and when war is declared it is, of course, imperative that we have national unity without question in prosecuting that war. In fact, whenever a foreign-policy commitment has been fully determined by the President and a majority of Congress, acting within the bounds of the Constitution, I will support that policy whether I like it or not. This view guided me in my vote for lease-lend appropriations, although I voted against the lease-lend law itself when it was under consideration by Congress. There is no merit in the plea for unity in supporting a policy calling for our closer approach to war before that policy has been finally approved by Congress. I do not believe my constituents want me to be that kind of a "yes man" and I do not wish to surrender my own convictions in respect to congressional votes on policies not yet adopted by Congress. As I said before, I will accept and support congressional policies when they have been properly adopted by vote of Congress, whether I like them or not, even though they mean our entrance into shooting war. But until then I will exercise my best judgment in determining my vote on such policies.

The proposed amendment of the Neutrality Act is a step closer to shooting war. I am opposed to taking this deliberate step into the present world war for various reasons. In my brief statement today it will be necessary for me to confine the rest of my comments to the military, not because of its greater importance but, rather, because of my work on the Military Affairs Committee, making it logical that I speak on that phase of the problem at this time. By limiting my statement to the military phase of the problem I do not want to leave the impression that I would favor our plunging into this war as an aggressor, even if we were so powerful as to guarantee a complete and crushing victory. Humanitarian, economic, and religious principles are not served by the exercise of military might alone.

As to military preparedness, America is not yet prepared to enter an all-out shooting war. The United States has only recently attained a position in preparedness that enables us to say we have adequate armament for training pur-

poses. Even our training program is not yet completed and will not be complete until we have enough ammunition to enable those soldiers who are members of combat teams to become thoroughly familiar with the functioning of their weapons through actual firing experience. I am of the opinion, however, that we now have enough well-trained men in our armed forces to make us relatively safe against invasion of our own lands, but we are not strong enough to send forth an expeditionary force. Military experts agree that the ratio of an invading force must be approximately 4 to 1 in manpower and also 4 to 1 in equipment to insure success in establishing a bridgehead and conducting a military campaign in enemy territory. The expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the limitation of shipping facilities existing in the world today make improbable an invasion of a force four times as great as our own, no matter what combination of nations may attempt it. We have been told by high military authority that a force of 500,000 well-trained and fully armed soldiers can successfully defend our shores against invasion. That does not mean, however, that we should stop our training program at that point.

Even a war that starts as a purely defensive war demands preparation far beyond the needs for defense purposes. The 4-to-1 ratio I mentioned a minute ago applies just as effectively to any expeditionary force that we might contemplate in carrying the war to the doorsteps of other nations. Military authorities also say we should not plan an expeditionary force until we can guarantee transportation and safe landing of approximately 7 tons of equipment per individual soldier in that force. It is no military secret that our own shipping facilities total approximately 8,000,000 tons, and, of course, not all of that shipping can be given over to serving an expeditionary force. It is also not a military secret that Great Britain has considerably more than twice as much shipping capacity as we have. If Great Britain has hesitated to launch an expeditionary force across the English Channel, we should at least stop, look, and listen before trying to launch an expeditionary force across the Atlantic Ocean. Sending an expeditionary force to Africa, Europe, or Asia without adequate shipping facilities will be a thinly veiled bluff that may presage an American Dunkirk.

With war flaming in Europe, Congress was called into special session September 20, 1939, to lift the arms embargo, but my Committee on Military Affairs was not permitted to meet once during that special session of Congress and no major legislative action for our preparedness effort was given serious consideration until the invasion of the Lowlands in June 1940. This occurred in spite of the well-known fact that it would take us 2 years to produce adequate armament for war. We have done a marvelous job, but we have not yet overcome the handicap of that long delay in starting our defense effort. Let us give our Nation a break and control our emotions at least until we have a chance to win, and then

let us think long and hard before we undertake to police the entire world. The United States is just now within sight of becoming the most powerful nation on earth, provided we do not commit suicide in our lust for world mastery and the subjugation of all countries who may cross our path.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

LET US VOTE "NO" ON THIS FINAL STEP TO WAR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, day after day, week after week, month after month, I have watched the deceitful steps that have led us to the brink of war. During this same time I have not only listened to the arguments for taking these steps, but, like you, have read innumerable papers, magazines, and publications on both sides of war involvement.

Various editors, columnists, and writers accuse us, who vote against steps leading to war, of doing so because of the presence of citizens of German extraction in our districts. Others accuse us of being blinded by our hate of the President. Others accuse us of playing cheap politics. Still others accuse us of being provincial and some have even accused us of not voting for our own national defense.

I harbor no personal resentment toward these accusers. Most of them are in protected storm cellars and no doubt expect to be for the duration. They can change their minds when they wish. They are not ever charged with the responsibility of voting. Please let me call your attention to the fact that if we all voted today in keeping with any one of the party platforms of last year, there would be complete unity of the people of this country on this question of war or peace. Did it ever occur to you that sometime someone might want to know why so many of the majority party have voted against these steps to war? Have they voted this way for the same reasons attributed to us or have they, as I personally believe, voted their honest convictions? Or are they the ones who have kept faith with their people?

I have no authority to speak for anyone from Wisconsin but myself, but I would like to present a few Wisconsin facts to my colleagues here today:

First. One of the reasons that the large majority of the people of Wisconsin do not want to become involved in war is because the State has a large percentage of foreign-born citizens who came to this country in order to keep out of the wars of Europe. They are not only opposed to this war but to all war, except one based on the defense of this Nation. This group includes not only Germans who settled in Wisconsin from 1850 to 1900, but nationals from many other countries as well.

Second. Another reason the people of Wisconsin do not want to become involved in this war is because they remember the last war. They well remember the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and his stand at that time. They remember the deceit and deception employed in an effort to ruin this illustrious son of our State. They remember that he was even hanged in

effigy. They all too well remember that after the war was over they found that what Senator La Follette had told them was the truth, and that what the war party had said was honeycombed with deceit, deception, and falsehoods. Even university professors hung their heads in shame and publicly apologized for not following his leadership. The people of Wisconsin know that this great man's statue is now in Statuary Hall, right here in this building, and that he is proudly recognized as one of the outstanding citizens of our State for all time.

Now, if any political party is going to be ruined by its elected Representatives following its platform it should be ruined because the people can start another party; but they cannot replace the United States of America, and what it has stood for in the eyes of the common man during these 150 years—if we follow this war party down the road to war.

Time after time Representatives from other States have said to me "I wish I came from Wisconsin so that I could vote my conscience." My reply to them always is, "Regardless of whether you came from Wisconsin or any other State, you should vote your conscience, you should vote your convictions, and you should vote in strict accordance with the promises you made your people when you were a candidate seeking their votes for office." Otherwise democracy is a farce.

Let us be charitable to them, but let us not be misled by the white-headed and the war-profit conscious, the childless, and those more interested in some foreign philosophy of government than they are in our own—especially when you know as well as I do that they do not intend to spill one drop of their own blood nor that of their kin if it can be avoided in this mad rush to war.

Let us not be influenced by political threats and intimidations regardless of their source. Let us not be influenced by any groups, in or out of our own districts, unless they are sincerely, primarily, and wholly interested in the welfare of our own country. That is the test. Allow me to repeat this: If any group is not sincerely, primarily, and wholly interested in the welfare of our own country, their counsel is valueless and their opinions are unworthy of our consideration. Let us forever put the life blood of every mother's son ahead of our own political ambitions.

Let us not be disturbed by accusations of provincialism or political expediency.

Let us vote "no" because we believe it to be the right and honorable way to vote and not because we have any hate in our hearts for any man.

Let us be guided only by our conscience and our judgment and let us assure the people of this country that at least we—the direct Representatives of the people—have kept the faith.

Let us vote "no" as we all promised the people we would vote, just 1 short year ago.

In conclusion, my dear colleagues, let us not be misled by any worldly masters regardless of their earthly importance; let us realize that this is the most important and responsible moment of our lives; let us realize that we are this day, as never before, our brothers' keeper;

let us not have the blood of our brothers upon our hands, nor the responsibility of their destruction on our souls; let our footsteps be guided only by our Maker and let us vote according to His teachings.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said here about the boys and putting them into the war. I remember entering a high school in one of the small cities of Massachusetts and seeing a monument that interested me very much. The story is this: A young Irish boy named McGorty had gone into the last World War and was on a submarine. A torpedo passed through the submarine and released the steam down below. All the men below were parboiled. There was no opportunity for those on deck to escape, because the engine had not been stopped. The engine was running full speed. The commander would not call for volunteers, but he stated the situation, and this little Irish boy volunteered to go down. He disappeared into the hold and never came up again, but the engine stopped, and all of the men above deck took their boats and sailed out a safe distance. As the submarine settled down, the commander lifted his hat and said, "God, I have today sent to you a man."

Mr. Speaker, there were over 2,000 just such Jimmie McGortys who were destroyed during the World War. I am not going to enumerate the boys who are resting over in France, nor those here, our cripples, and in hospitals, because that has been already covered, but I would have you know in the brief moments I have today, that this is not the first time that we have been appealed to by foreign nations. All through our history we have had those appeals made to us. In the early days there were trying times during the French Revolution. The sympathies of the people here were with France. There was great excitement. They had their propaganda but when the real test came, those men of iron in Congress in those days adhered to the foreign policy laid down by George Washington. I recall another instance, when Austria raped Hungary. There was great excitement in this country, and in Congress. Kossuth came over here and was entertained, wined, dined, and received by the House of Representatives, by the Senate, and by the President of the United States. Finally Henry Clay called him to one side and told him what to expect, and outlined our foreign policy as enunciated by Washington in no uncertain terms.

Henry Clay did not flatter or deceive Kossuth. Here is what Clay said to the great Hungarian patriot from overseas:

By the policy to which we have adhered since the days of Washington * * * we have done more for the cause of liberty in the world than arms could effect; we have shown to other nations the way to greatness and happiness. * * * Far better is it for ourselves, for Hungary, and the cause of liberty, that adhering to our pacific system and avoiding the distant wars of Europe, we should keep our lamp burning brightly on this western shore, as a light to all nations, than

to hazard its utter extinction amid the ruins of fallen and falling republics in Europe.

Again Congress refused to depart from its fixed policy of neutrality.

At the time Greece wanted help in their fight for independence against the Turks, the propaganda started with the atrocities and about the infidels. Here was a Christian nation. It was our duty to get in and recognize their independence. Webster made one of his most remarkable speeches in favor of assistance to Greece. But what happened? The Congress adhered strictly to the rules of neutrality.

In 1863 there was an attempt to get us to join the Holy Alliance. I would ask you to read the argument of Secretary of State William H. Seward, wherein he outlined in no uncertain terms the fundamental doctrine of neutrality, nonentangling alliances, with the result that we did not go into that alliance.

Oh, yes. Excitement ran high. We had pictures of atrocities and injustice, and every reason that we hear today for getting into this war. The one time that we departed from those fundamental principles was in 1917. We have been struggling all these years and will struggle for many years hence before we have even discharged those obligations. No intention except on the part of one country to pay its debts, and that was little Finland. Look at the combination abroad and the kaleidoscopic changes that have taken place since we were going to quarantine the aggressor nations. Here was a solid axis of Berlin, Tokyo and Rome, and they were against Russia. Inside of 2 years after that Russia and Germany were raping Poland, reducing those people to abject poverty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Is not the gentlemen surprised that America was so absolutely unprepared for this flood of propaganda which has descended upon us, knowing as every intelligent American must have known that it would come when this situation developed abroad?

Mr. REED of New York. I have the figures, and they are documented, of the amount of money appropriated by the Parliament of Great Britain to bend the will of the American people and get them into war in 1917.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not unfortunate that speakers, as they have done this afternoon, will imply that a man who does not want to take America into this war is in any sense friendly to Hitler and his regime? Is that not unfair and untrue and unwarranted?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, it is.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman know of a single man in this House who is friendly toward Hitler and who would help him if he could?

Mr. REED of New York. Not one; not one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, may we know how the time stands?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has consumed 2 hours and 5 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 1 hour and 6½ minutes; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] 1 hour and 13½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a chart showing the production of foodstuffs in Iowa, to prove that the Iowa farmer is doing his part in this defense-production program, since food is the first essential. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings today on the pending amendments be suspended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

ADDITIONAL POLICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 5553, an act providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "\$130,625" and insert "\$103,708."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "\$21,375" and insert "\$16,625."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the bill as it comes back to the House is the same as it was when it passed the House, except the amount has been reduced to put it on a 7-month basis instead of a 9-month basis?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, that is true. This is the bill introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] providing for 100 additional policemen for the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia. The heavy influx of visitors, businessmen, and employees from all parts of the country and the attendant congestion renders this reinforcement of the police department imperative, and this bill providing for an additional 100 officers has the unanimous approval of all concerned.

As passed by the House, the bill was expected to become effective in August, and therefore carried funds for the remainder of the year. However, as passed by the Senate, it becomes effective 2 months later. The amount provided in the House bill, of course, allowed for salaries covering the period from the ex-

pected date of enactment to the end of the fiscal year, while the Senate amendments naturally make provision only for the period from the actual date of enactment to the end of the fiscal year.

The two Senate amendments are in effect really one amendment, as the two combined cover the amount appropriated to cover the expense of the additional force. It is the practice in appropriating for the support of the police force of the District to allocate the cost from two separate funds—the general fund and the gas-tax fund. The House bill appropriated \$130,625 from the general fund and \$21,375 from the gas funds. The Senate amendments in reducing the period affected from 9 months to 7 months, reduce the appropriation out of the general fund from \$130,625 to \$103,708, and the appropriation out of the gas-tax fund from \$21,375 to \$16,625, a proportionate reduction. In other words, the only Senate change is merely a reduction by the amount no longer necessary to pay the additional officers for the remainder of the fiscal year.

In view of the fact that the bill as passed by the Senate is otherwise in the identical form in which it passed the House, I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RADIO ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP BECKMAN

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, Archbishop of Dubuque, will speak at 8:15 tonight on the subject that has been under consideration in the House today. Because of a conflict with other programs, we may not all be able to hear the archbishop at 8:15. Arrangements have therefore been made to rebroadcast the speech by transcription at 11:15. He may therefore be heard at 11:15 tonight over station WOL.

BILL TO REPEAL FEDERAL USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAY, for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 272. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 273. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 274. An act for the relief of the Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 381. An act for the relief of Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 806. An act for the relief of Carmella Ridgwell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1127. An act for the relief of Harriett Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1177. An act granting an annuity to William F. Pack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1372. An act to amend article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1523. An act for the relief of the Portland Sportswear Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1562. An act for the relief of William D. Warren; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Pauline Caton Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1654. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1762. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to release the claim of the United States to certain land within Cocino County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1771. An act for the relief of R. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1777. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Phillips and for the six minor children of Robert Lee Phillips and the late Estelle Phillips, namely, Robert Lee Phillips, Jr., James Rudolph Phillips, Katherine Phillips, Richard Eugene Phillips, Charles Ray Phillips, and David Delano Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1778. An act for the relief of Leslie Truax; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1906. An act for the relief of the estate of O. K. Himley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1958. An act to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1973. An act to provide for the pay and costs of transportation of civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, and in Alaska; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2035. An act to amend sections 345 and 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-marketing quotas; to the Department of Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 13, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, November 13, 1941, to continue hearings on proposed amendments to Securities Act, 1933, and Stock Exchange Act, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, November 13, 1941, at 10 a. m., to consider the following bills:

H. R. 5588. To authorize the issuance of certificates of service to applicants for engine-room ratings on vessels, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5672. To authorize the issuance of certificates of service to applicants for engine-room ratings on vessels, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Committee on Agriculture will have open hearings on Monday, November 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., to consider the 4-H Club and Rural Youth Act, H. R. 4530.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1072. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of September 1941 (H. Doc. No. 439); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1073. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting certain decorations which have been bestowed upon the Surgeon General of the Public Health

Service and other medical officers in that service by certain foreign governments in appreciation and recognition of assistance rendered by these officers in matters relating to sanitation and health; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1074. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of the custody of a portion of the Croatan National Forest, N. C., from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1075. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1076. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$300,000 (H. Doc. No. 438); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2. A bill to provide for a discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 6008. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide the payment to States of an average of \$20 per month per capita for all recipients of old-age assistance, under the several State plans, who are 65 years of age or older and not inmates of a public institution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6009. A bill to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6010. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in potatoes so as to provide an adequate and stable supply with fair prices for producers and consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 6011. A bill to provide for a fish-cultural station in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6012. A bill to repeal section 3540 of chapter 33 (a) of Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6013. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain land to the Terri-

tory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6014. A bill to make the workman's compensation laws of Alaska and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 6020. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. Con. Res. 57. Providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on the bill H. R. 5479; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 337. Resolution to set up a committee of five members of the House of Representatives to study and report upon the suggested changes in tax rates and benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended, and all acts relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 338. Resolution to create a committee to investigate the activities of so-called dollar-a-year men employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 6015. A bill for the relief of Truscon Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 6016. A bill for the relief of Michael-Leonard Seed Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6017. A bill granting a pension to Inez Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 6018. A bill granting a pension to Alva A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 6019. A bill for the relief of the Home Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2042. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Journeymen Barbers Union, Local No. 295, Los Angeles, Calif., recommending that defense housing projects be placed in the hands of local housing men who are acquainted with the territory, instead of setting up additional organizations to handle the work; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2043. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, No. 2223, requesting joint Army and Navy board to consider San Francisco Bay project proposed by John Reber, in connection with consideration of proposed low-level bridge from Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2044. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 2223, passed by Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, requesting joint Army and Navy board to consider San Fran-

cisco Bay project proposed by John Reber, in connection with consideration of proposed low-level bridge from Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Polish Czechoslovak Alliance, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2046. Also, petition of the National Small Businessman's Association, Akron, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supply of materials required for defense production, including lend-lease and other exports; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and the omnibus rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1941

Chaplain Henry R. Wescott, Jr., United States Army, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us allow a poet to lead us toward prayer:

The woods were dark and the night was black,
And only an owl could see the track;
Yet the cheery driver made his way
Through the great pine woods as if 'twere day.

I asked him, "How do you manage to see?
The road and the forest are one to me."
"To me as well," he replied, "and I
Can only drive by the path in the sky."

I looked above, where the treetops tall
Rose from the road like an ebony wall,
And lo, a beautiful starry lane
Wound as the road wound and made it plain.

And since, when the path of my life is drear
And all is blackness and doubt and fear,
When the horrors of midnight are here below
And I see not a step of the way to go,
Then, ah, then I can look on high
And walk on earth by the path in the sky.

Let us pray: Eternal Spirit, so help us who are in this place of potent influence that we shall walk on earth this day and all the days by the path in the sky. Lead, Kindly Light, amid the gloom encircling the world. Incline the citizens of our Nation and those who legislate for them to follow Thy leadership. Then shall we aid in overcoming the brutalities of life; then shall we gather to our companionship in effort the many who by their selfish independence are delaying the perfecting of Thy Kingdom in the world.

Make us willing to banish minor loyalties for the sake of a larger and more valuable loyalty; swerve us in national and international matters from what would lead to unfortunate actions and unhappy sequent memories. Guard us against having to undo some actions, against having to admit in the confessional of God and of world relationships that we were unfair and unjust. So guide and reinforce our Nation that it shall fulfill the ancient prophecy, "My servant art thou through whom I shall break into glory." To this end impel us

to give the arts of peace priority over all else.

Withhold not Thy benediction from our President, the Vice President, the Cabinet, and the Congress. Reinforce them physically; refresh them spiritually daily; enable them to be equal to their heavy responsibilities.

And to Thy name shall be the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REGULATION OF SIZES AND WEIGHTS OF MOTOR VEHICLES—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, composed of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and myself, I desire to give notice, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I have called a hearing to consider Senate bill 2015 entitled "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of the sizes and weights of motor vehicles engaged in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce," the hearing to be held at 10 o'clock a. m., December 8, 1941, in the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee room.

This notice is given for the convenience of the many interested parties who desire to appear and be heard. In the future it will be convenient for Senators and Representatives to refer inquiries as to date of hearings to the page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where this notice is inserted.

The committee will convene from day to day until all interested parties have had a chance to be heard.

As the correspondence from parties concerned in the various States of the Union has become so voluminous that it is difficult to handle, I make this statement and give this notice to every one who may be interested.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5553) providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5553) providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other